THEORETICAL AND DISCUSSION JOURNAL OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

MAY 1967

Marxism Today

EDITORIAL COMMENTS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF COMMUNIST PARTY — QUESTIONS OF IDEOLOGY AND CULTURE

JOHN HOSTETTLER — THE FUTURE OF BRITISH TRANSPORT

E. & R. FROW — THE PETTICOAT REBELLION

DAVID N. MARGOLIES — CHRISTOPHER CAUDWELL AND MARXIST CRITICISM

DISCUSSION:

B. D. BERGQUIST, D. A. WILSON — MARXISM AND CRITICISM

NANETTE WHITBREAD — HOW ABILITIES ARE FORMED

Monthly 2/-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Marxism Today

Vol. 11 No. 5

CONTENTS

		page
	Editorial Comments	129
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF COMMUNIST PARTY	Questions of Ideology and Culture	134
John HOSTETTLER	The Future of British Transport	139
Edmund & Ruth FROW	The Petticoat Rebellion ...	146
David N. MARGOLIES	Christopher Caudwell and the Foundations of Marxist Criticism	149
DISCUSSION: B. D. BERGQUIST, D. A. WILSON	Marxism and Criticism ...	156
Nanette WHITBREAD	How Abilities are Formed ...	159

AMONG ARTICLES IN JUNE AND FORTHCOMING ISSUES

Andrew ROTHSTEIN	The March 1917 Revolution in Russia
James KLUGMANN	The October Revolution and the British Working Class
Jack WODDIS	The October Revolution and the National Liberation Movement
Colin YARDLEY	Radicalism, Liberalism and Marxism
Gordon MCLENNAN	Role of the Communist Party
Bert WARD	Local Government
F. C. BALL	More Light on Tressell
Kay BEAUCHAMP	Racialism in Britain
Maurice DOBB	The Centenary of Capital
Alan BOLD	The Difference that Faltered
John LEWIS	Dialogue between Christianity and Marxism: a Reply

Editor James Klugmann

Editorial Board

Professor J. D. Bernal
Emile Burns
Gabriel Carritt
Maurice Cornforth
Maurice Dobb
John Gollan
Jack Hendy
Arnold Kettle
John Lewis
Frank McKenna
John Mahon
Alan Morton

Editorial Correspondence
James Klugmann
16 King Street, W.C.2

Advertisements
Doris Allison,
above address

Orders and Subscriptions
usual agents or
Central Books Ltd.,
37 Gray's Inn Road,
London, W.C.1

Subscription rates
Six issues 14s. 6d.
Twelve issues 29s.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Editorial Comments

IN the growing controversy that presages the end of the Government's wage restraint policy more attention ought to be paid to the antics of the Prices and Incomes Board. This body, composed of one super-egoist, Mr. Aubrey Jones, and a tiny group of mediocrities, has been allowed to assume the power of commenting on every wage rate in the country, in addition to telling every industry precisely what is wrong with it.

Very often it tells one industry the exact opposite of what it tells the other. It told the Railway industry in 1965 that in estimating wages it was not the basic wage rates that mattered but the actual take home pay. From the point of view of wage rates, it said, the railwaymen appeared to be low paid but from the point of view of actual take home pay they were not too badly off. So a principle appeared to be established, namely that in estimating how well-off a group of workers happened to be, it is earnings that had to be taken into account.

We then come to the drapery trades where the workers' earnings are low compared with other occupations. The Prices and Incomes Board now turns round and takes wage rates as the measure of the worker's well-being. Of course earnings are low compared with other occupations, it says, but this is because overtime and piece-work allowances are not possible in the drapery trades. But if one compares wage-rates in drapery with those outside the drapery, workers are not doing so badly. So here it is wage rates that are taken into account. The PIB obviously agrees with the American politician who said "Them's my principles. If you don't like them they can be changed".

Productivity Bargaining

A year or so ago "productivity bargaining" was all the rage. Indeed many active trade unionists thought that this was the answer to wage freezes. If wage rates were frozen then one could get productivity bargains inside the factories and earnings would rise just the same. The pay freeze, however, stopped most productivity bargaining also.

Now the PIB has explained that it is not opposed to productivity bargaining provided the workers raise productivity first and then claim their reward afterwards. This proposition is supposed to protect the economy from phoney productivity bargaining. It is an unbelievable insult to trade unionists and will be widely resented.

Perhaps one of the reasons why trade unionists have not resented more the Prices and Incomes Board is the belief that after all it is preventing prices from rising. This is a myth. In the last twelve months—March 1966 to March 1967—the retail prices index has risen by 4 per cent. This is an exceedingly high rise to take place, particularly when in the last eight months there has been a recession, deliberately created by the Government. There is not the slightest evidence that the Prices and Incomes Board has had any effect on holding down prices at all.

The Mask Comes Off

The Economist has now been encouraged to come out and tell the Government that the real and only purpose of the so-called incomes policy is to attack trade union collective bargaining. It is entirely wrong, *The Economist* alleges, to "curb movements in free market prices, even when rises in them are plainly necessary for efficiency". The Government, according to *The Economist*, has been merely playing about with price control in order to induce the unions to accept wage restraint. It is time to abandon this sweetener, which is no good, and straightforwardly attack the unions:

> "So it is time for supporters of an incomes policy to take a deep breath and recognise that all this nonsense of price control and the like is no longer an aid to inculcating the idea of an incomes policy but on the contrary has become a barrier to imposing it. . . . The need now is to concentrate the attack of incomes policy on the monopoly element of trade union bargaining alone."

Thus incomes policy takes off the mask and declares its intention of holding down wages while letting prices rise. If the big monopolies push up prices that is the free market and one must not interfere with a "freely functioning economy". If the unions then try to push up wages to catch up, why that is an example of the monopoly element of "trade union bargaining", and must be stopped.

The sooner the incomes policy racket is repudiated by the movement the better. No time should be wasted in pursuing the will of the wisp of a better incomes policy.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What Marx Did Not Say

This year is the centenary of the publication of the first volume of "Capital" in Berlin in September 1867 and already a number of books are appearing to accompany the occasion. Joan Robinson, as we saw last month, has republished her "*Essay on Marxian Economics* with a new introduction and now we have Professor H. B. Acton, of Edinburgh University, on *What Marx Really Said* (MacDonald, 15s.).

"What Marx Really Said" is of course an advance on "What Marx Really Meant" that was popular in the 1930s, and Professor Acton gives a number of quotations and tries to be fair as to how and why Marx developed his doctrines.

Acton, as befits a Professor of Moral Philosophy, devotes his major attention to Historical Materialism by way of quotation and criticism and arrives at the conclusion that what Marx was advocating in his theory of historical materialism was an "Economico-Technological Theory of History". Contrasting Marx with the well-known 19th century economic historian Thorold Rogers, Professor Acton tells us that "Rogers did not however like Marx hold that economic factors are the sole independent determining factors in history, but on the contrary, allowed weight to religious and political factors also". Yet a few pages before, Professor Acton quotes Marx as saying that in revolutionary periods "one should always distinguish between the material revolution in the economic conditions of production which can be faithfully substantiated by the methods of the natural sciences, *and the juridical, political, religious, artistic, in brief, the ideological forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out*". Ignoring religious and political factors indeed!

On the very next page Professor Acton quotes a famous passage from Marx's *Eighteenth Brumaire* on the role of leading political figures in the French Revolution in sweeping away the institutions of feudalism, so enabling capitalist society to develop. No ignoring of political factors here!

Mr. Acton also quotes the famous preface in the *Critique of Political Economy* that "at a certain stage of their development, the material forces of production of the society come into conflict with the existing relations of production, or, what is only a legal expression for these, with the property relationship within which they had hitherto moved. From being forms of development of the forces of production these relationships are changed into their fetters. Then comes a period of social revolution".

It is the contradictions between the forces of production and the property relations within the capitalist mode of production, expressed in the class struggle which is at once economic, political and ideological, that is the motor of social change. This is what an "economico-technological theory of history" strictly defined would leave out, and what Marx most certainly did not.

Professor Acton might also have reflected on the relative independence of the ideology superstructure and the reactions of the superstructure on the mode of production. Those who are beginning to study Marx in this centenary year would be well advised to start with Marx and Engels themselves in their simpler expositions of Marxism, and then with some Marxist writer who gives a sketch of the whole field, say John Lewis' *Life and Teaching of Karl Marx*. Then one can advance in clarity to a deeper study.

International Significance of October Revolution

An international conference of Marxist scholars held in Moscow on March 28th-31st was probably the most remarkable of its kind for many years. Devoted to the subject of "The International Significance of the October Revolution"—as part of this year's fiftieth anniversary celebrations of that great event—it assembled about 500 historians from the Soviet Union, some 80 from other Socialist countries, and 30 from countries where capitalism still prevails. By the nature of things, large numbers of the participants had played a considerable part in the history of the Communist Parties and other sections of the revolutionary movement of their respective countries. The presence among many others on the platform, at the opening session, of veteran Russian Communists like 90-year-old F. V. Petrov, whose membership card shows 1896 as the date of entry into the revolutionary Social-Democratic movement and Lydia Fotieva, who worked with Lenin and his wife Krupskaya in Geneva in 1904, and was his secretary after the 1917 Revolution, of Dolores Ibarruri, leader of the Spanish Communists and Nguyen Khan Toan, Director of the Institute of Social Sciences of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, symbolised this unity of past and present in the appreciation of the greatest of all tests of Marxism—the taking of power by the working class, under the leadership of a Marxist party, in a great country, to hold it already for half a century.

The first session opened with penetrating reports by P. N. Fedoseyev, Vice-President of the Soviet Academy of Sciences ("The International Significance of the Historical Experience of October") and Academician I. I. Minz on its importance for human progress. Leading Bulgarian, Hungarian, GDR, Mongolian, Polish and Rumanian, Yugoslav and Czechoslovak Marxist historians read papers on their country's response to November 1917. On the second day—following a contribution from the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vietnam professor—came the second main Soviet report, by Timur Timofeyev, the young Director of a recently established Institute of the International Workers' Movement, on "The great October and the World Workers' Movement".

Then came the turn of the historians from the countries of capitalism—Portugal, France, Belgium, Italy, Finland, Panama (for the Latin American countries) and, next day, Lebanon (for the Arab countries), Austria and Great Britain. The speaker on British reactions to the Socialist revolution in Russia was Andrew Rothstein, invited as chairman of the Marx Memorial Library. In the committees many more extremely valuable papers were read. The proceedings of this unique conference are to be published in a number of languages, and will beyond question constitute a massive contribution to working-class history.

Vietnam's History

Current Books of Sydney have done us a service by publishing an English translation of Jean Chesneaux's *The Vietnamese Nation.*[1] This is a revised and somewhat abridged version of a book originally published by the Editions Sociales in Paris in 1954.

Jean Chesneaux is certainly known to a number of our readers. He was captured and imprisoned by the Nazis when fighting in the French Resistance. He has made many visits to many parts of the Middle and Far East. Since 1955 he has been Director of Modern Far East Historical Studies in the *Ecole des Hautes Etudes* at the Sorbonne. His works include a "Biography of Sun Yat-Sen" (1959), a "History of the Chinese Labour Movement, 1919-27" (1962), and a "History of Secret Societies in Modern China and Vietnam" (1965).

This book is a general and popular history covering the whole ground from the Confederation of tribes of *Au-lac* around the third century B.C. when the embryo of a Vietnamese State first appeared, at the moment of dissolution of primitive communist society right up to the victory of Dien Bien Phu and the Geneva Agreement of 1954. The beginning of the American aggression is described in a short concluding chapter written in 1962.

One of the most interesting sections is that on the peasant rebellions which continually recurred in the 16th-18th century.

Particularly interesting is the account of the great peasant insurrection of the Tay-Son which, at the end of the eighteenth century, united most of the country and held out for thirty years against the armies of the feudal monarchy, its French mercenaries and its Manchu protectors.

Father Diego de Jumilla, a Spanish missionary recounts:

> "Last year, in 1773, at the beginning of the month of April, Cochin-Chinese troops began to circulate in company with mountain bandits . . . they came down to the market during the day, armed some with swords, others with arrows, others again with guns . . . they appeared to desire equality for all Cochin-Chinese; they entered the houses of the rich and, if they were offered some present, they did no damage. But if they were offered resistance, they seized the most luxurious articles, which they distributed amongst the poor, keeping for themselves only rice and victuals . . . they were called virtuous thieves, and they were said to be charitable towards the poor plebians."

Buddhist and Taoist clergy, writes Chesneaux, supported the movement. The peasant insurrections, however widespread, popular, well-organised, could not in the end prove victorious over feudalism, but their struggles still inspire the Vietnamese people today.

Buddhists and National Liberation

Some Westerners who think of Buddhism in terms purely of contemplation and passivity may be surprised to read of Buddhist priests "engaged" in support for a peasant insurrection movement.

They would do well to read a recent controversial book on *Buddha, Marx and God*[2] by Trevor Ling, Lecturer in Philosophy and the History of Religion at Leeds University.

Marxists might wish to contest some of Mr. Ling's approaches to Marxism, but they will find very much that is interesting in his history of the rise and spread of Buddhism and of its relations to Marxism.

Mr. Ling quotes with approval a very profound study—*Lokayata*,[3] by the Indian Marxist Chattopadhyaya, who considers that

> "the age of Buddha was an age when as a result of the development of the forces of production, the northern regions of India were witnessing the rise of ruthless state-powers on the ruins of the tribal societies. Trade and war were creating unheard-of miseries in the lives of the people; the greed for private property knew no bounds".

Those who have any doubts of the continued "engagement" of Buddhists to progressive struggles should also read a book, recently published by the S.C.M. Press, the author of which is a Vietnamese

[1] Jean Chesneaux—*The Vietnamese Nation: Contribution to a History*, Current Book Distributors, 168-174 Day Street, Sydney, N.S.W.

[2] Trevor Ling—*Buddha, Marx and God*, Macmillan, 35s.

[3] D. Chattopadhyaya—*Lokayata: A Study in Ancient Indian Materialism*, New Delhi, 1959.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Buddhist scholar, poet and monk, Thich Nhat Hanh,[4] whom many of our readers may have seen and heard at this Easter's CND demonstration.

Objective conditions, he writes, in Vietnamese society have at different periods, compelled the Buddhist religion to engage itself in the life of the nation.

He treats of the history of Buddhism, its different streams, its place in South-East Asia, and then comes on to more recent times. The Buddhists became aware very early "that the regime of Ngo Dinh Diem was one under which they could not breathe easily". He insists that there are many patriotic, non-Communist elements in the National Liberation Front who:

> "joined the Front because they agreed with it that they must oppose the regime of President Diem and the policies of the Americans which they had begun to see as a clear extension of the earlier French policies."

Many Buddhists, he writes in the final Chapter of his book, see the need for the "actualisation" of Buddhism, for it to come to terms with contemporary life.

> "Each country, each time, each place, has its own form of living conditions, and living religion must change and adapt to these so that it may be a part of the social milieu of its time."

State Monopoly Capitalism

The most recent issue of the *Economic Bulletin*, published by the Economic Committee of the Communist Party, contains an abridged translation of an article by the French Marxist economist Henri Jourdain on "State Monopoly Capitalism, Democracy and Socialism".

One point made by the author is that you cannot measure the degree of development of state monopoly capitalism simply by the size of the public sector of the economy. In the USA, for instance, the public sector is relatively small, but the Federal State finances 75 per cent of fundamental and development research and intervenes in the economy in a host of ways.

The article discusses in the main the development of State monopoly capitalism in France, but also raises a number of general issues.

Writing of the relation of state monopoly capitalism to the problem of transition to socialism Henri Jourdain argues:

> "Always obliged to strengthen its hold on the state, the monopoly bourgeoisie in so doing strengthens state monopoly capitalism in its specific, *essentially capitalist* forms. (Their *essential* object consists in increased capitalist monopolisation for profit.)
>
> "But because these are public and consequently *social*, these forms *objectively come close* to socialist ones. It follows that the development of state monopoly capitalism expresses *at one and the same time the strengthening on the one hand of monopoly and oligarchic hegemony in society, and on the other, an intensive development of the basis for transition to anti-monopoly democracy and socialism.*"

And therefore, he continues

> "at the present stage of development of state monopoly capitalism, the major objective of the working class and the democratic forces, is to replace the monopoly bourgeoisie at the head of the State".

The article is closely argued and raises many polemical problems worthy of discussion. The *Economic Bulletin* is as reputed for the interest of its contents as for the irregularity of its appearance. In this issue the Editor promises that future issues will appear "at more reasonable intervals", and we strongly advise our readers by some or other means to procure them.[5]

The Scottish Carter

Time was when not a few of the trade union histories were a mishmash of anecdotal memories of retiring officers, illustrated with formal portraits of successive secretaries. In more recent years, with Robin Page Arnot's works on the miners (to which a study of the South Wales Miners will shortly be added), with James Jefferys on the engineers, Philip Bagwell on the railwaymen, J. E. Mortimer on the draughtsmen, to mention only a few, some really serious history is being written.

Now, we are glad to say, the Scottish Horse and Motormen's Association (which in 1964 became the Scottish Commercial Motormen's Union) has found a worthy historian in Angela Tuckett.

Her study *The Scottish Carter*[6] starts from the earliest efforts to form a union. In the words of Alexander Kitson, the present General Secretary, she gives:

> "a real human picture of the gallant struggle by the old carters to overcome the intolerable conditions and humiliations imposed upon them; of how they learned from bitter experience the need for a skilful and permanent organisation and the need to fight for recognition".

She tells of the development of the workers' outlooks from the relations obtaining between

[4] Thich Nhat Hanh—*Vietnam: the Lotus in the Sea of Fire*, S.C.M. Press, 1967.

[5] Single copies 1s. 6d. By subscription from Central Books, 7s. post free for four issues.

[6] Angela Tuckett—*The Scottish Carter: the History of the Scottish Horse and Motormen's Association, 1898-1964*, Allen & Unwin, 45s.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

master and servant in the difficult conditions of the horse-drawn era to the present problems of collective bargaining.

She relates how, with the change from horse to mechanical traction, came the fight for measures of public control. She describes both the nationalisation and denationalisation of road transport, and why the Union today feels so firmly that the only answer to the traffic crisis is an integrated transport system under public ownership.

This was not an easy history to write. Many key records were scattered, incomplete or simply missing. It was a work in which passionate sympathy with the struggles she was depicting was combined with work of painstaking detailed research.

YCL Congress and Festival

The coming 26th Young Communist League Congress being held at the Derbyshire Miners' Holiday Camp, Skegness, from May 27th to June 3rd this year, promises to be of more than usual interest and importance.

As well as the Congress itself, which will centre around such issues as the need for socialism, ending the US aggression in Vietnam, the Labour Government's home and foreign policy, youth rights and unity and the building of the YCL, a Festival of Socialism is being organised.

One aspect of the Festival is the holding of a number of discussions and dialogues on questions like Marxism and Christianity; Liberalism, Radicalism, and Socialism; World Population and Hunger; and Love, Sex and Morality. There will be lectures followed by discussion on Socialism and Communism, the war in Vietnam, Freedom and Democracy, and other subjects.

There will be a festival of films including films of the Great Russian Revolution to be shown at a special evening devoted to the celebration of the 50th anniversary.

The Vietnam Campaign will be discussed both at the Congress and Festival. The YCL has so far, as a result of its campaigning, donated £970 for medical aid and it is hoped by the time of the Congress, this will be well past the £1,000.

It is interesting that a number of British youth organisations are sending observers to the Congress. These include the British Youth Council, United Nations Students' Association, British Council of Churches, Church of England, Co-operative Youth, Youth CND, Young Liberals and Liberal Students.

Readers of *Marxism Today* will be welcome at the Festival.[7]

Incidentally the Karl Marx poster produced a few months ago is selling well, and the YCL have now produced a double crown Lenin Poster in honour of the 50th Anniversary.[8]

House on Clerkenwell Green

The approval of the Minister of Housing for the preservation order on Marx House, issued previously by the Greater London Council, after a four-year fight against it by the Islington Borough Council, is a recognition of the place of Marx House in the Labour and Socialist history of Britain.

This action of the Minister was the result of the painstaking research work of Andrew Rothstein, chairman of Marx Memorial Library, written up in that fine small book *The House on Clerkenwell Green*. This resulted in broad support being enlisted in the effort to prevent demolition of this historic building.

The Library will no doubt now have to get support from the same broad forces to re-establish the building to its 18th century look and to modernise it for more effective use today.

This action by the Minister coincides with the slow but continuous progress of the Marx Memorial Library and its varied educational activities over the past few years.

Attendance at its lectures, courses and discussion conferences have been steadily getting larger and membership is growing. The 1967 Marx Memorial lecture by Maurice Dobb on "The Centenary of 'Capital' and its Relevance Today" is to be followed up by three more popular lectures by Lionel Mumby, Henry Collins and J. R. Campbell, to be given at Marx House.

It is to be hoped that the 1967 AGM of the Library's members will use this moment to map out bold new plans for the extension of all its library and education activities during this centenary year of the publication of Marx's monumental work *Capital*.

---

[7] Details including costs from Festival Organiser, 16 King Street, London, W.C.2.

[8] 5s. plus 1s. 6d. postage each, obtainable from YCL, 16 King Street, London, W.C.2.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Questions of Ideology and Culture

Statement from the Executive Committee of the Communist Party of Great Britain . . . for discussion

(*This statement was adopted by the Executive Committee on March 11th, 1967.* Marxism Today *would be glad to receive discussion contributions of up to 2,000 words.*)

IN no earlier phase in man's history has the world presented such striking contrasts as it does today. Science, technology, man's capacity to control nature leap ahead at breakneck speed, yet the greater part of mankind still lives in poverty and hunger. The same science can immeasurably improve man's conditions of life or be used for destruction. The epoch we live in is one of revolutionary change, of transition from one social system to another, from capitalism to socialism. To speed and to lead that change, and so to help open out a new era in man's history, is the role of Communist Parties throughout the world.

We live in a world of struggle. The great social transformation, now on the order of the day, is neither an easy nor a spontaneous process. Men of monopoly and Empire do not lightly surrender. And the struggles—economic, political, social—are reflected in the realm of ideology. Ideas of war, of race, of self-enrichment, of despair and self-destruction do battle, consciously and unconsciously, in the service of the old, dying system of capitalism.

For many people all seems confused, uncertain; established beliefs fade, established outlooks are questioned. In the turmoil of contrast and change they can see no future, no purpose or direction. In this situation it is natural that many are now turning to Marxism precisely because it points the way forward to a socialist and communist society; because it shows how the vast potentiality of science can be put to the service of man, how culture can be freed from the degrading commercialism of capitalist society, and because Marxism can give men a sense of confidence in their own capacity to change the world.

Among those turning to Marxism in interest and hope are many who raise questions about the attitude of the Communist Party, concerned as it is, with bringing about the socialist transformation of society, to issues of great importance for humanity—questions of science, culture, religion, democracy. It is good and welcome that they do so. For Marxism too must itself continuously face up to the new problems of the mid-twentieth century, must continuously develop, shed dogmatism, overcome deficiencies, listen to critics and clarify its attitudes.

We regard the clarification of our attitudes to such questions of ideology and culture as of first importance at this critical moment in world history. But we cannot here attempt to define the attitude of Communists to all the issues raised by these questions. Rather we wish to state our approach to the nature of the work of scientists, artists and others today and under socialism and to indicate, as clearly as possible, the grounds for joint discussion and action in the achievement of socialism. We believe that these issues are of interest, not only to scientists and artists themselves, but to wide sections of the people, including industrial workers, who are deeply interested in and closely affected by developments in the sciences and the arts.

Science

Marxist philosophy is based on the study of reality through the use of scientific method, by which theories are tested in practice. Just as the laws of nature are derived from scientific study and practice, so Marxism attempts to penetrate the nature of social evolution and establish its laws by use of scientific method. Marxism, therefore, bases itself on science and cannot be separated from science. It points to the need for the spread of scientific education on a wide scale so that all may have the means of understanding natural and social phenomena.

The twentieth century is a period of extremely rapid scientific advance. Scientists are investigating ever more thoroughly the complexities of nature and, for the first time, discovering the nature of life itself. Vast sources of power are opening up, space is subject to human exploration, while new particles of matter are being discovered.

Communists welcome this advance. We see the task of the scientist as that of exploring

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nature, society, man, of enriching man's knowledge of every aspect of the universe, and of taking part in the application of this knowledge for the benefit of man.

Under capitalism, the development of science and technology is restricted and distorted. This is inevitable when much of it is influenced, or even controlled, by monopoly and other big private profit interests, and when half this country's research and development spending is for military purposes involving one in four scientists and technologists.

Universities, Technical Colleges and Research Institutes are not accorded the resources they need for the development of effective research, while the vital importance of science itself, of scientific organisation and planning are insufficiently recognised. In addition to this, immense social problems have arisen as a result of the productive potentialities of the new automation and computer techniques. These problems cannot be solved by capitalism, but only in a socialist system.

Science must serve the people, and the battle for this end begins *now*, under capitalism. Socialist society will, we consider, provide the conditions for the massive development of scientific enquiry.

The extent of resources to be made available for science must be determined by the community as a whole through its democratic institutions. Careful planning of the use of these resources is, of course, essential—priorities must be determined in the light of social needs as well as the state of science itself. In deciding these priorities scientists can make their special contribution through scientific organisations, universities and research institutes as well as government bodies, so influencing the direction of scientific investment and advance. Although at particular times special attention will have to be paid to particular fields, all scientific research should be encouraged, including pure research carried through without concern for its immediate practical application.

The Communist Party, therefore, welcomes the most critical, enquiring and searching spirit among scientists, whose function, we recognise is to explore all aspects of phenomena and to avoid going into enquiry with a fixed notion of the result. The development of science requires the free confrontation of different scientific theories, and, where necessary, prolonged debate. We recognise, first, that only experiment and testing in practice can decide which of any two or more theories is valid, and, secondly, that theories and hypotheses that provide an adequate explanation of phenomena at one date will most probably be modified later and sometimes even be replaced by new and more complete theories.

We recognise that when attempts have been made in a dogmatic way to limit the scope of scientific investigation, to determine as foregone conclusions theories that could not be established as a result of research, debate and experiment, as in the case of Lysenko, the result has been extremely harmful for science, for scientists and for Marxism itself. The Communist Party, therefore, does not and will not attempt to "lay down a line" on science, to forecast the results of scientific research, or decide questions still under investigation. It considers that this is the field of scientists themselves and encourages the confrontation of conflicting approaches as an integral part of science. Above all, we will encourage the study of nature and of society in all its complexity and contradictions. For the more freely men explore nature the more effectively can they control it in the interests of man; the more they understand society the more they will fight to develop and change it.

Art

A fundamental aim of the Communist Party is to bring into being a society where art and culture flourish and where all may participate in artistic activity. We recognise the debasement and perversion of art and culture today resulting from commercialism. Art to no small extent has become a commodity sold for profit. Yet under even capitalism art is far from subdued, and creative artists in every field resist its encroachments and degradation. The struggle goes on in art as in politics.

Communists will fight against all restrictions of art imposed under capitalism, seek to defend its free development and extend its availability.

We do not think that, under socialism, painting, sculpture, literature, music must comply with a single standard, congenial to all, or immediately comprehensible without effort and study, but that society, through education and the facilities it provides, must make both the enjoyment and the practice of one or other field of artistic activity easily available to all sections of the people. By this means a free choice can be made as to which branch or branches of culture may be enjoyed and practised.

Marxist historians and critics have made a considerable contribution to the study of the history of culture—its relations to society, to the struggle of classes—and to understanding how it arose and the role it has played. Marxism can assist the analysis and disclose the relations between works of art and the social and political conditions which gave rise to them. We recognise, however, that much difficult but exciting work lies ahead for those who are making a Marxist approach to the problem of artistic values, and we welcome the most extensive discussion in this field.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Communists know that art exercises a deep influence on people's thoughts and attitudes and lives, and that art can move people to progressive or reactionary ends. We welcome artists in every field who lend their talents in their own particular way to the struggle for peace, freedom and socialism.

But the Communist Party, during the fight for and under socialism, does not see its task as being to direct what should be written, painted or composed —either in terms of subject or of style; it does not see its role as laying down laws governing literary and artistic creation. We reject the concept that art, literature or culture should reflect only one (official) school or style. On the contrary, we look on innovation in art as part of its very heart and nature. Not every innovation will lead to positive results, but without it culture will be stifled and stultified. We think it probable that art under communism will change its nature more than we can today foresee.

The history of culture shows that many of its greatest innovators and protagonists have drawn deep inspiration from the people and their struggles, from the progressive classes and forces of their day. At certain periods, cultural work has played directly a part of great importance in progressive political struggles; today, for instance, the novel, drama, poetry, music, song can give a powerful stimulus to the struggle for an end to United States aggression in Vietnam, against racialism, for peace and socialism.

But at the same time the direct political struggle, past and present, is not, in any sense, the only subject of art. We recognise that artists convey their views of reality, their dreams and passions, in a multitude of ways.

We welcome, therefore, the widest variety of artistic approaches, subjects and styles, and encourage our members freely to express their views. We welcome creative workers who, in their work, or as part of it, speak clearly on the urgent issues of the day, and help to win people for the struggle for peace and socialism. But this does not mean, in any sense, that *all* artistic work can or should, play a direct political role.

Above all we know that creative workers who are committed to the struggle of peace, socialism and communism will, in one way or another, express these ideals in their work. While creative workers must have the conditions freely to develop their work, as well as opportunities and means of publication and exhibition, we see our task as being to win their political conviction, to inspire them with opposition to capitalism and confidence in socialism, and so to practical activity in the different facets of the struggle. There can be no doubt that progressive artistic activity, expressing confidence in man and his future, can be a great force in developing a socialist consciousness; but this can only be achieved to the fullest possible extent if artistic creation is carried out in conditions of freedom.

Religion

The Communist Party welcomes the discussion taking place in many religious groupings around the great social, political and moral issues of our time, the turn of many people of different religions towards progressive causes and struggles, the efforts of many churches to come to terms with the discoveries of science and modern technique.

We welcome especially the developing dialogue between Christianity and Marxism, the genuine attempts being made on both sides to get rid of false conceptions of each other, the beginnings of personal contact and friendship, the shedding of older sectarian approaches, the frank discussion of our fundamental differences as well as all points of contact and co-operation.

One of the conditions for fruitful dialogue is complete sincerity with each other, a recognition of our differences of approach and philosophy as well as our points of agreement and co-operation.

We do not seek for a moment to disguise that as Marxists our philosophy is based on science and that we do not believe in the supernatural or in personal gods. We do not conceal our criticism, which is shared by many religious people, of the reactionary role so often played by religious establishments and institutions, nor the fact that religion has at times been used to secure obedience and acceptance of unjust and evil rule. But we do not make the mistake of reducing religion to this aspect of its existence. We know equally that religious faith has also inspired men and women to courageous action and sacrifice for progressive causes.

We recognise that there can be much common ground in our faith in the future of man, in our joint concern for moral values, and in the striving for a world where men can live as brothers and human individuality be expressed; we recognise also that there are many urgent issues for common effort; the preservation of peace, opposition to racialism, the fight against all forms of discrimination, servitude, indignity. Examination of this common ground as well as the means of joint action would be fruitful for both sides.

Communists have confidence in the future of mankind; in man's ability through struggle and effort to transform society, increasingly to gain control of nature and so to open up new vistas for humanity. We hold that human nature is not fixed; that men and women in the course of ending class exploitation, injustice, war, in the course of changing society, will change their own nature and fit themselves for the future society, in which human

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

personality can develop to the full. The history of man will be a continuous, never-ending exploration of nature and man.

Such is the Marxist perspective; in the meantime it is evident that there is a great need as well as a firm basis for common contact and work between Marxists, atheists, agnostics, and those who hold a religious faith.

To facilitate this we wish to make it clear that the Communist Party will fight now under capitalism, and work in the future under socialism, for complete freedom of religious worship, for the right of all faiths to worship in their own churches with their own sacred books and for making available the resources necessary for ritual articles. We consider that both under capitalism and socialism, religious and non-religious views should freely contend. Finally we wish to make it clear that the Communist Party welcomes people of any religious faith including those who are ministers, not only working side by side with Marxists in common causes, but as members of the Communist Party, provided they accept the political programme of our party. We have never made, nor will we, acceptance of religious beliefs a bar to membership of our party.

Democracy

The Communist Party is sometimes asked, what is its attitude to the transition to socialism? How do we envisage the change from capitalist democracy to socialist democracy?

With the publication in 1951 of our programme, *The British Road to Socialism*, we have shown how, in our opinion, this transformation may be brought about.

The aim of the Communist Party in the first place is to win socialism, when political and economic power pass out of the hands of the capitalist class into the hands of the working class. We hold that this involves a revolutionary change—a socialist revolution. Revolutionary change does not necessarily involve violence and bloodshed—it can take different forms; essentially, revolutionary change involves a fundamental change in political power. Any attempt by reactionaries to use force or illegal means to resist or obstruct the socialist legislation of the elected government of the people will have to be firmly rejected. To secure and defend the revolution, the rule of the working people is essential. Given the unity of the working class, as well as leadership and clarity of purpose, the people can be strong enough to hold their gains. We believe that the possibility now exists of achieving socialism through our traditional democratic institutions including Parliament by struggle but without armed conflict and civil war. It is this perspective which is held out in our programme and which forms the basis of our policy.

Monopoly capitalism is at present vigorously attacking all the achievements of democracy. It is our aim to defend these achievements and to develop them to the maximum extent. The freedom of the trade unions, freedom of the press, of meeting, the freedoms embodied in our democratic institutions, the jury system, local government, parliament, were won in the struggle of the working class and its allies in the past. Their defence and extension is an essential aspect of the advance to socialism, as is the ending of all forms of racial discrimination, and the recognition of national rights for Scotland and Wales.

The more effectively these freedoms are now defended and extended, the more easily will the transition to socialism be brought about.

Communists see socialist democracy as both a continuation and a qualitative extension of all that is best in democracy under capitalism. What has been won must be kept, but the essential limitations of capitalist democracy—ownership by a small minority of capitalists of the key sources of wealth, their domination of the machinery of state, and of the institutions of education, culture, the press and opinion formation—must be ended, and in different forms pass into the hands of the majority.

In *The British Road to Socialism* we make clear that we do not envisage the advance to socialism as the work of a single party, but as the work of a broad front in which the Communist Party, the socialists of the Labour Party and Labour movement, industrial and professional workers and intellectuals, participate together in common struggle inside and outside Parliament.

We stand for a plurality of parties, including those that do not accept, or oppose, the advance to socialism. Naturally all parties will be expected to obey the laws of the land passed by the democratically elected socialist majority.

Socialist ideas and socialist leaders will be strengthened by the daily contest of ideas and attitudes that this will necessitate. We stand for taking away from such parties the special class privileges, based on the ownership of private property, that they enjoy today. But we aim to defeat parties defending specific class privileges by the strength of socialist ideas, the success of a socialist economy, culture and administration, and by the mass struggle of the people led by the working class. Only if such parties themselves undertake violent or illegal activity will they invoke against themselves measures of law. But such is not our aim.

Humanism

We, who are Marxists, claim to be the most consistent humanists of our time. One cannot be a genuine humanist in words alone.

We stand for a classless, communist society, where

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all men and women, freed from the divisions of class, from national and racial hostilities, can develop to the full their human potentialities. But to reach such a society men and women must struggle now against war, against colonialism, against the exploitation of man by man, against the dehumanisation that capitalism inevitably involves both for the majority of ruled and the minority of rulers.

Modern technique is beyond individual control; it cannot be fitted into the framework of capitalist firms or even national frontiers. Science and technique, the results of long-term collective activity, require a new social organisation for their full potential development. Such technique can remove from mankind the sordid cares of hunger, disease, monotonous, repetitious labour, drudgery in all its forms, and take away the fears of insecurity. The achievement of socialism and still more, communism, will speed the day when science and technique can so develop that the age-old division of mental and manual labour will be brought to an end.

In such a society the individual can really blossom, develop to the full his "slumbering powers". In such a society, man can begin to live a fully human existence, bringing to an end his alienation from the products of his activity and so from society, and entering into a direct relation with his fellow men.

For Communists the aim and purpose of all our action and struggle is not only a world where exploitation and oppression is ended, where the full resources of science and technique are released and put in the service of man, where the fear of war is ended, but a society—a communist Britain and a communist world—where the individual can freely develop his many-sided talents.

The Communist Party

It is for this end that Communists all over the world have lived, fought, sacrificed, and sometimes died. Whether man today is on the threshold of a new society, or whether mankind fails even to survive to reach this society, depends to no small extent on what we do today. Never has any generation held to this extent posterity in its hands!

For technique can be used for destruction as well as for construction; if the bombs begin to fall, the survivors, if any, might regret their survival.

Millions, as we know, can starve in a world of surplus, redundancy can reduce families to fear and misery when the machines are brought to a halt. In this world of contradictions many seek a road, a direction, a purpose, "a strategy for struggle". Without it, some will accept the system; others, bewildered, come to despair and passivity.

Marxism does not replace the labour of scientists nor the creation of artists, yet it gives them an approach to an understanding of the world in all its complexity, and indicates how they can help so to change it that their inventions and creations are turned to the joy and welfare of man.

The weakness of the great working-class movement of this country, with all its strength and traditions of organisation and struggle, has been above all a lack of theory and perspective. This is what reformism's boasts of pragmatism mean. For the adaptation to circumstances, rejection of theory, means acceptance of the capitalist outlook and of capitalist society.

We welcome all those who have come in one way or another to appreciate the importance of Marxist approaches in different fields of research. We hope to work closely in discussion and co-operation with them. But we feel that a consistent, logical application of Marxism to the world today, above all to problems of changing it, of ending imperialism, capitalism, and building socialism and communism demands Marxist political organisation—the Communist Party.

We appeal, therefore, to all to deeply consider this question and to join our ranks. As Marx wrote the point is not just to interpret the world, but to change it. If there is to *be* a world to be *interpreted* it will have to be *changed.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Future of British Transport

John Hostettler

THERE are few people today who do not hold strong views on the pressing problems of traffic and transport.

Indeed we all participate in and contribute towards these problems as we also benefit or suffer from them in many different ways.

This closeness to the question however, is partly responsible for the difficulty we experience in getting to the heart of what the transport problem is really about.

The Heart of the Problem

The first essential is to see that transport is today an urban problem. Roads carry almost 90 per cent of the country's passenger traffic and according to the recent White Paper on "Transport Policy" about 80 per cent of our population live in urban areas where, as a consequence, most journeys take place. Far and away the most serious difficulties in connection with traffic and transport arise within towns and not in getting from one town to another.

Secondly, I think we should accept that the private motor-car is a boon with a great potential for good, although it can only be enjoyed and used properly if the basis of its present misuse is removed. To this end efficient cheap attractive public transport is essential and the car must not be seen as a necessity for every journey. Indeed its main purpose should be recreational and not a replacement of public transport. The Buchanan Report, unfortunately, does not go far enough in recognising this.

Thirdly, transport is now so vast and complex that it is primarily a problem of planning. Therefore it must be treated in a wider context than before and be seen as the major political issue that it is.

General Planning and the Buchanan Report

The movement of goods and people on a vast scale has been a characteristic of developing production. Today, with the rapid growth of the motor-car, it has reached proportions which the capitalist system is unable to manage or control. Currently, the daily movement to and from work during the peak hours is the greatest problem, but continued traffic will, unless properly planned and provided for, lead to round-the-clock conditions as bad as, or worse than those now experienced in London's "rush hour".

Unable to ignore what was so obvious, the last Tory administration appointed the Buchanan team of planners, architects and engineers to look into this problem to see what could be done.

The Buchanan Report, however, is in no sense a plan. Its terms of reference were "to study the long-term development of roads and traffic in urban areas and their influence on the urban environment". The importance of this was world-wide. For the first time a scientific study was made of the effects on the built-up areas, and therefore on people's lives, of the motor-car at its present and estimated future level of use. This estimate was of 41 million vehicles on the road by 2010, as compared with 10½ million at the time of the Report. At present there are over 13 million vehicles plying our roads of which 8½ million are private cars. It is estimated another 8 million will appear on the streets in the next four years as well as tens of thousands of commercial vehicles. The Government's Road Research Laboratory forecasts that vehicle miles travelled will double between now and 1980 and the Institute of Civil Engineers estimate road congestion will cost £2,000 million per annum by 1970.

On these terms it will be readily appreciated that transport is indeed a problem of urban planning.

The Buchanan Report warns that "unless steps are taken, the motor-vehicle will defeat its own utility and bring about a disastrous degradation of the surroundings for living".

The Report stresses, however, the overall importance of establishing environmental standards and points out that basically there are two kinds of road—distributors designed for movement and access roads to serve buildings.

Protecting the Environment

It expresses the need for protecting the environment and relieving congestion and one of the basic requirements on this is seen as a modern network of high capacity traffic routes. Some of the more important conclusions and proposals of the Report may be summarised as follows:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(i) That the best use is not made of the motor-vehicle now because roads are inefficient and traffic has an adverse effect on life and urban surroundings.

(ii) To accommodate large numbers of vehicles in towns requires physical alterations aimed at canalising longer movements on to adequate networks serving "environmental areas" thus freed from extraneous traffic.

(iii) There are absolute limits to the amount of traffic that can be accepted in towns, depending on their size and density, but up to those limits (provided a civilised environment is to prevail) the level of vehicular accessibility a town can have depends on acceptance of and payment for necessary physical changes.

(iv) Long-term plans should be made for all large urban areas and should contain proposals for controlling demand to match planned provision by means of zone permits, road pricing, parking policy and public transport subsidy.

(v) Parking policy is of key importance and must be publicly controlled; present parking policies need re-examination.

(vi) The most potent factor in maintaining a "ceiling" on private car traffic in busy areas is the provision of good, cheap public transport, coupled with the public's understanding of the position.

(vii) Roads must be built with proper regard to safeguarding environment. If major physical changes are out of the question, then accessibility must be sacrificed. Traffic must be deliberately restrained until urban areas are in proper shape to accommodate it. Therefore environmental management is necessary.

It is clear that the political implications of the Report are considerable and that nationalisation of urban land would be necessary to enable our built-up areas to be reconstructed according to Buchanan principles to provide tolerable living conditions for the people.

Major Planning Problems

In modern times the motor-vehicle has brought about a major change in the location of industry and population, and in the whole way of life of the people of this country without any forethought or planning.

Before the last war, the sales of private cars were almost entirely to the upper and middle classes, and this economic limitation had the effect of preserving tolerable conditions on the roads. In addition to profit from sale of vehicles however, the development of public road transport was another profitable form of investment both in the provision of buses in towns and countryside and in the haulage of all forms of goods and merchandise.

These changes in transport were inevitably followed by physical changes in the built-up areas; new industries and plants were established away from the railways, but readily accessible by road; new suburbs were built for the new private car owners on the outskirts of existing towns and cities and not necessarily well sited in relation to public forms of transport.

Long-Term Approach

During this period, the private ownership of land and the limited powers and resources of local authorities, meant that the new road traffic inevitably followed the old road pattern. However, the greatly increased volume of extraneous traffic, particularly heavy goods vehicles, caused severe congestion in many built-up areas, and the 1930s saw a period of new road construction aimed simply at easing these conditions. A number of circular and by-pass roads were built, merely conveying the extraneous traffic around the point of congestion and depositing it further along the route. Little understanding of the behaviour of traffic at high speeds was shown and traffic junctions along these supposedly fast roads were mostly no different from any in the towns. The frontages of these new roads were exploited for building sites, with houses, shopping centres, garages and factories, each with their own vehicle access roads and parking problems, until the roads in many cases became so blocked and dangerous that the 30 m.p.h. speed limit had to be imposed.

Nevertheless, as public services have deteriorated, there has been a greater inclination to take to the private car. Yet the increased congestion that this causes, as well as the decrease in the fare-paying passengers, further reduces the effectiveness of public transport services.

Whatever governments come and go in the future, the situation and problems outlined above will be with us and will increase. Governments will of necessity have to deal with them in some way or another, and the extent to which they deal with them in a thorough and fundamental manner, will depend on the extent of their progressive character and support. The test of their aims will be the extent to which they are prepared to undermine the oil monopolies and motor manufacturers.

As already indicated, the Buchanan Report, whatever its shortcomings, is a valuable document. Its scientific approach can be a valuable start to a progressive government prepared to tackle the planning and traffic problems of the day.

It is also clear that this gigantic problem will only

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be fully tackled by a government which is engaged on a programme of socialist construction in accordance with National and Regional Plans.

Many of the difficulties in transport arise from the nature of capitalist society, and the necessary changes must be brought about by the working class and all progressive people. But in any long-term plans for socialist reconstruction, full regard would need to be taken of the recommendations of the Buchanan Report in the circumstances then prevailing.

Such long-term plans must allow for big changes in the attitude to and the role of private and public road transport.

The Buchanan Report itself says: "It is impossible, except in the smaller towns, to provide for all movements to be made in individual motor-vehicles . . . obviously some degree of reliance upon mass transport is unavoidable."

In fact, unless we abandon our towns, a public service is essential. This is a basic choice we have to make. And we have to make it more decisively than Buchanan who has not come out strongly enough for public transport for journeys to and from work.

Immediate Proposals

A national programme of major road improvement is required to deal with the through-ways of "primary distributors" and on a scale to meet the needs of the present situation. All highways authorities should, as part of their Development Plans, be carrying out surveys, and preparing plans for the reconstruction of communities by "traffic management" and "road improvement" schemes must be prevented.

This will necessitate the gradual removal of extraneous traffic from environmental areas and an end to the degrading of environment with the rapid growth of danger, noise, fumes, smell, as well as the visual impact of a sea of cars and clutter of signs. Priority must also be given to the needs of pedestrians rather than vehicles.

"Environmental areas" does not, however, necessarily mean expensive rebuilding. In its simplest form it could mean that in certain existing residential roads a barrier is erected at one end thus converting them into cul-de-sacs or "no through roads". Residents' cars, delivery vans, etc. could continue to go into these roads and out again but would not be able to use them as through roads to get somewhere else.

In the long term, of course (but starting now), much more needs to be done. The motor-car is beneficial, but because of inefficient mobility and its adverse effects on human life and surroundings, it has become a major social problem. The answer is to develop areas for civilised urban life by canalising all longer vehicle movements on the properly designed networks. As there are absolute limits to the amount of traffic a town can accept, substantial physical changes will be necessary and will have to be paid for.

At present the capital investment spent on motor-vehicles is out of all proportion to that spent on the roads, and the former continues to rise at a fantastically greater rate than the latter. This represents a problem than can be faced, and the Government should also recognise that the large increase in the number of vehicles each year provides ever larger tax revenues that could help offset the cost of large-scale works.

Traffic Control

The question of control of traffic in town centres and more widely must inevitably assume more and more importance. This is at the root of the main dilemma of the Buchanan Report.

Apart from architectural, planning and health considerations, the sheer volume of traffic has virtually reached saturation point in many places and has the further disadvantage of also impeding public transport on roads.

Statistically, saturation point is said to be 550 vehicles per thousand persons and though this number has not yet been reached, the number of vehicles per mile of road is already higher than in the United States.

Whilst the use of private cars cannot be opposed —in many places they are indispensable—what is needed is *the provision of far more frequent, efficient and cheaper public transport with uniform fares, in all towns and cities*. This is not only desirable socially, but could have an important effect in easing acute traffic congestion. Research in London among car commuters has indicated that a standard fare of say one shilling per journey on buses and tubes would reduce the cars travelling into the centre of the town by about 40 per cent. This result cannot be taken for granted but neither should the research carried out be ignored. The cost of a cheap fares policy would not be particularly high, and apart from the question of subsidy, there would be savings resulting from a freer flow of public transport. Subsidising would also be necessary, however, to make public transport attractive as considerably cheaper than private cars.

Undoubtedly private traffic itself in the main cities and towns takes traffic away from the public services; it makes them less economic, causes road congestion that slows and reduces the capacity of bus services and makes the movement of private cars themselves more difficult. On this basis there-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fore it is also necessary to *advocate severe measures to discourage the use of cars for travelling to work in congested areas, including the giving of notice now that on-street parking will be strictly prohibited in those areas in, say, two years' time.* This does not mean merely city centres. In London it could mean many areas of extreme congestion, and the effect would be better than a complete ban on cars which would not then be necessary and is extremely difficult to enforce. To say a parking ban has not worked in say Oxford Street is irrelevant as here I am considering large areas of congestion and in the context of far better and cheaper public services being available than exist at present.

In Scotland a senior planner has recently proposed confining car-parking in the centre of Edinburgh to streets where there is little traffic flow and to a reduced number of controlled parking spaces. He then wants fees from parking meters to go to subsidising public transport. On this basis he claims a standard fare of 4d. for any journey could be fixed and fare collection of individual fares abolished. Public transport would operate much more efficiently on the freer roads and vast capital expenditure at present planned would become unnecessary.[1]

So far as the country generally is concerned, it is certain that road improvements cannot keep pace with the increasing traffic any more than they can in towns. As a result we must face the fact that as the use of the car increases, its usefulness decreases. Financial considerations are very largely responsible for this, as spending on roads only increases in small doses. Even if this obstacle was overcome, however, the effect on the country-side of over-developing road systems would be appalling. The need for roads is so great that the motorways to London, far from solving the bottlenecks and traffic jams, have already made them far worse. The problem is highlighted at Hyde Park Corner and many other places.

Improvements that must be made in all forms of public transport should take into account the need to attract freight and car users off the roads, and public transport must be subsidised to make this possible.

Subsidising is essential as traffic management, enlarged parking facilities, extensive traffic light computers, and road development, which are all necessary, will never fully meet the need, and according to the South East Study, the massive investment programme necessary will cost at least £200 million.

[1] This proposal is similar in many respects to those made above and the detailed arguments and figures for such a policy for Edinburgh may be found in *The Scotsman* of January 18th, 1967.

The Case for a Subsidy

As already stated, commuter services into the cities must be vastly improved and public transport within the cities must be given a fair chance to develop. This involves some kind of a subsidy in the early stages, although a national integrated transport system may well enable profitable sections to subsidise unprofitable ones.

The main object of a subsidy is to keep the price of public transport low. It is particularly necessary to ensure that transport wages are kept level with the top wages in industry in order to increase the labour supply for a greatly improved public transport service.

There is no substitute for a greatly expanded public transport service to deal with the vast flow of commuters who pour into our great cities within the peak period in the mornings and evenings. Yet to make transport "pay" by constantly putting up the fares of these people is to drive them into running their own cars and increasing the traffic jams.

In June 1965, the Minister of Transport cancelled fare increases proposed for London, made available to the London Transport Board a subsidy of nearly £4 million, and undertook an examination of the conditions under which London Transport operates. This gives an idea of what can be done, and the recent White Paper indicates interim grants of up to £16 million with a Committee to consider more radical solutions. This does not go far enough, but indicates that public transport can be treated as a social service with fares pegged at existing levels and then reduced by stages.

In the larger cities it will also be necessary to improve the network of commuter lines (and in London, particularly, underground lines) in order to keep people off the streets and roads particularly in the rush hours.

Public transport must also be extended in other ways. New forms of public transport may well be introduced, such as small electric vehicles. The use of overhead monorails is being widely discussed at the present time in relation to some proposed new towns. Their main advantages are speed and relatively low construction costs. They also have the advantage of being able to move large numbers of people, while leaving the ground completely free. Nevertheless, we should be very cautious about their use in existing urban areas lest they destroy from above the amenities that we are trying to preserve on the ground.

Perhaps a solution will be found in developing a vehicle which can have disciplined control in towns and have free movement outside. Such automatic control in towns of cars and public transport is undoubtedly possible in a way that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could go a long way in reducing present congestion.

It must be stressed that the powers and resources of local authorities are totally inadequate to enable them to play a proper part in the physical reconstruction of Britain in which the principles of the Buchanan Report could be applied. Proposals for development control and planning at all levels, from Regional planning (including distribution of population and employment) to the detailed design of city centres should be adopted. As a part of this, traffic measures should be regarded as "development" within the Town and Country Planning Acts, so that greater control and co-ordination is possible and residents and road users with objections can be heard before it is too late to do anything. Although most traffic studies concentrate on keeping traffic on the move, traffic must also be seen as part of the comprehensive problem of town planning.

The limitation of the powers and resources of local authorities has always been Tory policy for obvious political reasons, but Labour has done little so far to change the balance.

We must therefore press vigorously for changes in legislation and finance so that the local authorities can build up their organisation and skilled staff in order to carry out these major works of construction and development, making inroads into the sphere of private developers into whose hands these plums are continually slipping.

Railways and Long Distance Road Haulage

A national transport policy must include the public ownership of these two great sections of national transport.

Road haulage today is systematically developed at the expense of the workers and of the public.

There are two ways of controlling this situation: first, increasing the penalties for evasion and enlarging the facilities for inspecting vehicles, and secondly, public ownership.

A necessary accompaniment of this would be the abolition of "C" licences in respect of private firms engaged in the long-distance transmission of their own goods. With both sections of long-distance transport (road and rail) under public ownership, the Transport authority controlling an integrated transport system would try and divert as much long-distance traffic as possible from the road to the railways—thus ending the absurdity of the under-used railways.

One of the outstanding problems is that the railways are under-utilised, while more and more traffic is going by road. In fact, apart from passenger traffic, road transport accounts for 80 per cent of the goods transported in Britain. Thus it is obvious that one of the major issues is to get more traffic on the railways and it is clear that legislative action will be needed to achieve this.

It appears that Labour policy is for the "expansion" of British Road Services. This is likely to be a long and costly form of extending nationalisation.

And although the present Labour Government's White Paper on Transport recognises that railways can play a useful role in the foreseeable future, the White Paper policy is generally too weak and makes no real effort to get to the root of the transport problems by nationalisation or operating Buchanan proposals. Furthermore, the Government is unwilling to provide sufficient finance for the far-reaching changes required.

Similarly the fierce competition between road and rail has greatly depressed wages and conditions in the transport industry. In road haulage rate cutting has led to firms evading the law on drivers' hours and rest periods, and to the encouragement of excessively long spells of work which greatly increase the danger of accidents. It is essential that the Ministry and the undertakings which it cont ols, should take into account the increasing strain of operating, particularly on roads, and pay wages which will attract and keep labour.

A New Policy Needed

We need a new type of transport policy which puts the interests of the British people first. To this end the following measures should be taken at once.

The Ministry of Transport should co-ordinate all sections of transport along the lines already mentioned. It should also develop a nationalised coastal shipping service and begin the construction of publicly-owned pipelines on a wide scale.

The Ministry should consider the basis and the distance for which heavy freights should be carried by road, subject to suitable rail transport being available. The railways should be given a fresh start. They should be relieved of all interest charges, including those incurred in the course of modernisation. On this basis they should fix their charges to cover their costs (including depreciation) and allow some contribution to the further development of the enterprises. The Government should be prepared to advance loans for additional development at a low rate of interest. In exceptional circumstances such as transport to remote districts a subsidy would still be necessary.

The nationalised Boards should be re-organised and staffed by people who are determined to make nationalisation a success. There must be more transport experts, more trade unionists, more direct representatives of the public on the nationalised boards. This is essential if nationalisation is to succeed.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In general terms a great deal must depend for the future on technological developments. Improvements in reducing the time of journeys can continue to arise from the electrification of the main lines and automatic signalling devices. More comfortable carriages, better meals, electrification, fewer couplings, etc. are all contributing towards greater comfort.

Electrification facilitates centralised control. In the near future we may see real-time computer control of Britain's entire railway system. This will lead to greater flexibility in schedules and in the introduction of extra trains to cope with peak demands without fundamentally affecting labour requirements. Automatic local train services are immediately practicable on technical grounds. The use of cybernetics in railway operations, with control systems to reduce train intervals, will greatly increase track capacity with a substantial improvement on heavy traffic routes.

At present coastal shipping is mainly based on transactions between nationalised industries. Coastal shipping today is responsible for 20 per cent of domestic ton-mileage of freight transport (thou gh only 3 per cent of tonnage) and accounts for less than 2 per cent of cost. There is a clear case for an extension of coastal shipping as a nationalised industry. This is particularly so with the planned improvements in the docks and with new methods of loading and unloading ships.

Air freight transport and domestic air travel are both increasing, although still accounting for low percentages of the national carrying. A tremendous increase in air traffic is likely and desirable but services by independent operators should be stopped immediately. We should call for the setting up of an Aero Space Advisory Council under the Ministry of Transport and for the nationalisation of all independent airlines.

Improvements are now being made in journeys to and from air terminals, booking and checking and for travel under average weather conditions. Measures to speed journeys to and from terminals depend upon road and rail. The current feeling is that helicopter and hovercraft links would be too expensive. Booking and checking is being streamlined and soon data-linked computer control will carry out these duties whilst receiving orders from receptionists at suitable points. Automatic landing systems will eliminate diversions of aircraft due to visibility within the next two or three years.

The hovercraft and the helicopter are useful for journeys unsuitable for aircraft requiring large runways (and hence relatively remote terminals) and also journeys unsuitable for either purely road to sea travel. Within Britain areas needing such vehicles include the Scottish Isles and the Channel and Solent crossings, and inter-city traffic could benefit considerably from such transport.

Inland Waterways, including canals, should also be developed and their use for pleasure-cruising, recreation and amenity should not be overlooked.

The better use of sea, canal and air facilities, together with a great expansion of pipelines is clearly of importance for a national transport policy.

Road Accidents

The terrible mounting toll of death and injury from road accidents is now a major social evil of our time. In the last ten years there has been a 44 per cent increase in deaths and injuries, involving a total of 3¼ million people. In 1964 alone, 8,000 people were killed and half a million injured. A fatal accident occurs every hour and seven minutes with an accident resulting in injury every one-and-a-half minutes of every day and night. In addition, it is estimated by the Road Research Laboratory that road accidents cost £220 million a year in damage to vehicles and property, medical treatment, police expenditure and the cutting short or interruption of life.

The causes for this shocking position are many and complex and there are no simple and easy solutions. They include a hopelessly inadequate road system; reckless and drunken driving; unsafe and defective lorries and cars and the lack of safety features in their construction. There is strong public demand to deal with these obvious causes and every government action such as speed limits, and breathaliser tests, is to be welcomed.

Also the mitigation of the effects of road accidents is as important as preventive action. The Motor Vehicles (Construction and Use) Regulations should be strengthened to oblige all motor manufacturers to fit safety belts, shatter-proof windscreens, collapsible steering wheels and interior padding as standard equipment—and, indeed, any other accessory which the Minister of Transport considers will make a vehicle safer.

But the whole question goes much deeper than this, and to put the blame on motorists as a whole, or even a small minority of reckless drivers is to avoid the real issues and solutions. This is the approach of the Government and the majority of the press—the approach of pious appeals and exhortations.

The fact is that an important technical and social change has taken place in Britain in the last 20 years; the change to a mass motorised age and society, and this change is accelerating. Millions of working-class families today see the motor-car as a necessity and not a luxury, as a means of widening their mobility and horizons of social contact and their share of the good things of life they themselves

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

produce. But in capitalist society, this change proceeds in the most chaotic and anarchistic way, with private vested interests getting the maximum profits from the change, whilst giving the absolute minimum attention to the serious social consequences. Millions of cars are flooded out from competitive factories without any national co-ordination; countless motor and petrol advertisements boost up the image of car driving as some kind of glamorous individualistic sport. These are the basic causes which underlie the grave problem. To find a solution, co-operation with motorists and other road users and their organisations is needed. There now has to be a many-sided attack on the problem by the government, drawing in all democratic organisations and being prepared to face up to the considerable financial and political questions involved.

Any real solution must include a massive road safety campaign directed towards making a high standard of social responsibility and discipline, the common behaviour of all drivers and road users. This should be backed by penal powers, and really adequate traffic patrolling. All advertising of vehicles and motor fuels which disregard the paramount factors of road safety and the social nature of motoring should be eliminated.

It is clear that these measures will touch on many problems of our society and many of them will only be carried into effect against the bitter opposition of powerful monopoly interests.

Health Hazards from Road Traffic

So far as atmospheric pollution is concerned, exhaust fumes are not generally considered apart from industrial and domestic atmospheric pollution. However, it is known that chronic bronchitis is much commoner in towns than in the country. Exhaust fumes are a respiratory irritant, though so far no relation has been shown between lung cancer and exhaust fumes. Carbon monoxide poisoning is a problem in cities and research shows it has a serious temporary effect on drivers and affects their responses to traffic lights and other drivers. The eyes are more seriously affected than is generally realised.

The effects of industrial noise on hearing, accident rates, fatigue and nervous disorders are well known. Ninety decibels, the level of noise reached in many busy streets is sufficient over the years to cause deafness. Certainly better designed vehicles, stricter enforcement of legislation on vehicle noise, care with traffic management schemes and the use of sound barriers or screens could all help. The effects of aircraft noise will also have to be more effectively tackled than at present.

In fact the whole field of health hazards from road traffic has been seriously neglected and requires far more research with a view to speedy remedial action.

The Challenge

These then are some of the problems brought about by the Transport Revolution. In an age of mobility this revolution cannot be halted and the clock put back. What we must aim to do is control the change in such a manner as to use its potential for society as a whole whilst preserving our towns and community life.

The changes called for by the "explosion" of the motor-car may in fact drive us to improve our towns making them better places to live in and an exciting part of the modern age. We cannot allow towns which, as the working week reduces will become more and more centres of cultural and richer life, to be strangled by cars commuting very often with only one person per car. Our existing towns have been built around, and can be extended around, widespread systems of public transport.

Proper planning of all forms of transport is now a vital necessity and should be welcomed, not in any restrictive sense, but as a challenge of the advancing age of technology and socialism.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Petticoat Rebellion

Edmund and Ruth Frow

"ANY woman working in industry who gets equal pay can count herself as one of a fortunate few." Betty Brown is a London clippie and she opens her recent article in the *Morning Star* (Saturday, February 4th, 1967) with this statement. She then points to other inequalities that women, even when they have equal pay, are forced to accept. She calls for action by men and women to obtain equal benefits. That is the position today; and certainly it is an advance on the position which has prevented woman from playing a full part in the economic, social and cultural life of the country since she was first subjugated in the interests of property.

Marian Ramelson[1] in *The Petticoat Rebellion* has traced the development of women in class society and mapped some of the roads by which she may become freed of her subordinate and subservient role, as society further develops through Socialism to a classless society. This gleam, which shines so clearly through the book, is one of the most important contributions that she makes towards the achievement of real freedom for women. But the understanding that future generations will obtain of the part that women have played in the struggle for their own emancipation, as well as the part that working class women have played in the struggles of their class, must be considered equally valuable. This is the *only* book which attempts to show the reasons for the position of women in a capitalist society and to analyse the movements which have contributed to the present comparatively advanced state of women in this country, from a class point of view.

In her opening the author writes of her experiences in Leeds in a working-class home. She writes with rare sympathy and gratitude of the influence of her Socialist father in shaping her ideas and ideals. When he was told that he was too old for work at thirty-five, she swore that she "would never be at peace with a system that could do such a thing to a human being". As her revolutionary activity broadened her outlook, she transferred her main declaration of war to that aspect of the system which specifically did such things to women and she sprang into battle on their behalf. She reports that she was "holding forth with considerable gusto on the need for women to go forth and emulate the Pankhursts", and was brought to a realisation that the historical setting of the Suffragettes was possibly more complicated than she had imagined by a warning that "The Pankhursts had done a lot of damage". In order to refute such apparent sacrilege she began what became ten years study and research, and the fruits of that labour will well serve the progressive movement as a basis for building the understanding of women's struggles.

[1] Marian Ramelson — *The Petticoat Rebellion*, Lawrence and Wishart, 42s.

In Primitive Society

One of the most popular fantasies is that fostered by the women's glossy magazines that woman's place is in the home, a source of comfort and domestic bliss for the use of her family and the breadwinner, her husband. This dream, that men have grasped so eagerly, is only one factor among many that have prevented the full equality of women. Marian Ramelson points out that physical differences between men do not determine their social status. If they did, the leaders of society would be the navvies and dockers who are generally speaking the stronger and more physically developed members of it. Why should women's lack of physical strength be the bar to her full acceptance as a citizen. Has this factor always been operative? It is from this query that the substance of the book develops.

She traces the position in primitive society where woman was regarded with honour as the source of life and played a leading part in the Council of the Tribe until the changes in the processes of production called for more advanced forms of tools which were the property of the men. These tools enabled a surplus to be produced and men were able to acquire property. In order to pass his property on to his son, a man had to be certain he knew who his son was. So he took a woman to be his wife and her children were his heirs. In order to ensure that they were his children, he prevented her from having other men's children and so the domination of man, the property owner and head of the family, over woman, his property, began.

"From the dawn of private property," writes Marian Ramelson, "aggressiveness has been a major built-in feature of society." Women have suffered from this inherent feature not only as exploited workers but as household slaves and providers of children. Aggression breeds revolt; for every slave in history, there is a slave's rebellion. Women, who have been doubly enslaved, have had to wage rebellion both as workers and as women. Is it any

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wonder that she is still only at the beginning of her advance to full freedom and full fruition as equal contributor to society.

The Radical Revolt

The theoretical position of women was first stated by Mary Wollstonecraft in the dawn of the French Revolution. Later another woman, Anna Wheeler, discussed the question with her friend, William Thompson and together they wrote the *Appeal of One Half Of The Human Race, Women, against the Pretensions of the Other Half, Men, To Restrain Them In Political and Thence Civil and Domestic Slavery*. In 1825, this was indeed a heart cry and the intolerable unhappiness caused by the ignominious position of women was fully stated and exposed. However, the time was not then ripe for change and nothing was done to ameliorate the situation. Nearly thirty years later, John Stuart Mill wrote *The Subjection of Women* as a memorial to his wife Harriet who, he said, had inspired the ideas.

While these three theoretical contributions were being written and published, working class women were taking their share in the many aspects of the class struggle which characterised the first half of the nineteenth century.

Women played a part in the Reform Movement which preceded the 1832 Reform Act. Many of them were injured at Peterloo, the Manchester demonstration dispersed by the Yeomanry Cavalry in 1819. They attended the mass meetings held in the growing industrial areas where the hand and domestic workers were squeezed out of a living by the technological developments of factory life. Women also played an outstanding part in the struggle for the freedom of the press from the excessive taxes which prevented the spread of knowledge. The Owenite movement had women among its earliest speakers and missionaries.

It would need a further volume fully to survey the part played by women in the radical movements of the first half of the century. The tantalising references to these women should ensure that the clues are followed by future scholars as quickly as possible. How many more manuscript letters are waiting in local libraries and museums telling the story of women's activities in those early days, like the letter from Anne Knight to Mrs. Rooke, her Chartist friend (found in York Public Library by Mrs. Constance Sheehan) which tells of her action in the cause of the suffrage? Each locality is pregnant with such fascinating clues. It only needs enterprise for a history of the women's movement to be written in each area.

Two Trends

During the second half of the century, the women were in continuous struggle. They claimed, and won, the right to education, to their own children, to their own money, to a say in many aspects of public life and to their right to struggle in its manifold aspects. Marian Ramelson shows how, at each stage of the story, there were always two trends in the movement. The women from the middle class never met on the same ground as the women from the working class. It is true that as the Cause developed its momentum towards the end of the century, the middle class leadership of the Suffrage Societies must have inspired women of all classes to follow them. How else can the huge demonstrations of women have been held?

The long campaign led by Mrs. Josephine Butler against the Contagious Diseases Acts temporarily united women as women. But, as the chapter headed "The Dialogue" makes clear, where middle class women campaigned, it was from a feminist point of view and working class women, whose incredibly difficult lives were outside middle class experience or comprehension, rightly regarded such action with guarded suspicion. Middle class ladies were unlikely to support strikers when they believed that legislation restricting the hours of labour of women and children was against the interests of women. This attitude, and that of the Trade Unions who were so immersed in the battle to secure legal recognition that they paid scant attention to the position of women, made the uphill path of the working class women even steeper.

A factor which still prevents women from playing the part that she will have to do in her own emancipation is that women, with their double burden of work both inside and outside the home, have neither

Please post *MARXISM TODAY* to me every month.

I enclose (put X in the appropriate box)

☐ 14s. 6d. for 6 months

☐ 29s. for one year.

(write in capital letters)

Name.....

Address.....

.....

Post with remittance to:

Central Books Ltd.,

37 Gray's Inn Road, London, W.C.1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

time nor energy to develop themselves. As Marian Ramelson points out, "It is far from sufficiently understood what a barrier the lack of time has always presented to the development of women as fully conscious, socially alert, properly educated human beings". This fact, together with the truth that no cause can transcend that of the working class in a capitalist society, accounts for the relatively small part played by the working class women in the struggle for the suffrage.

Votes for Women

It was a sad quirk of fate that no woman who played a leading role in the magnificent campaign which eventually obtained the vote for all women on the same basis as all men, became a Member of Parliament. It is also sad that so many women had to be tortured before this position was reached. During her ten years' research into the women's movement, one feels that Marian Ramelson lost none of her admiration for the Pankhursts as fighters for the Cause, but that their position in relation to the Women's Movement viewed as a whole underwent a sharp revision.

The final section of the book is devoted to an analysis of the position of women today in which some of the popular fallacies are exposed and torn to shreds. All women need the arguments used in the chapter, "How Free Is Free?" in their daily battles:

> "It is because of the battles fought and won in the past—forcing open the doors of education and the professions, winning the right to vote—that it it possible to place on today's agenda the next steps which are necessary to force the doors still wider and make further advances on the road to women's equality."

Looking Ahead

At the end of her book, Marian Ramelson justifies her life and the struggles of the women like her, who have devoted their energy to the women of their time. She looks into the future where the second technological revolution will have enabled the dirty and arduous work done by so many women to be done by automated machines; where women will have the time and the energy to develop all the latent talents which have been denied to society through the years; and where the reason for women's subjection, the ownership of private property, will have ended. She quotes the discussion at an international conference between a group of women from different parts of the world each of whom had a clear but distinctly different conception of what a family is. She says that we have no way of knowing what form of organisation the future will develop to allow every member of society a chance of full development, but we can be certain that future generations will face their problems and find solutions to ensure the emancipation of all mankind.

Inevitably, a book which reviews the struggles of more than a century must leave out as much as it includes. Individuals might question the choice of this aspect of the campaign and the rejection of that and point to many gaps which will have to be filled by other volumes. The answer to such criticism must be to put this book into the hands of all men and women working in the progressive movement. They need the ammunition which it provides in their daily struggles to emancipate all people. The more the book is used as a guide to action, the quicker will the gaps in its presentation be filled, and instead of "The Petticoat Rebellion" it will become "The Emancipation of Women".

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Christopher Caudwell and the Foundations of Marxist Criticism

David N. Margolies

(David Margolies wrote his B.Litt. thesis at Oxford on Christopher Caudwell and Marxist Criticism. He is currently editing some of Caudwell's unpublished manuscripts. He teaches English at Morgan State College, a predominantly Negro institution in Baltimore, Maryland.)

IN the thirty years that have passed since Caudwell's death and since the publication of his most important critical work, *Illusion and Reality*, there has been little published discussion of his work and certainly no major assessment of it has appeared. However, the current growth of interest in Caudwell's work now demands that Marxists assess Caudwell's place in Marxist theory and discuss his relevance for today.

Much of the increased interest in Caudwell comes from a new generation of Marxists whose attitude toward Marxism differs from that of the generation of the 'thirties. Many members of this new generation accept Marxism as an intellectual method but are not committed to it as a whole philosophy. They accept it as far as they find it useful for understanding the world. To them much of the critical writing of the 'thirties must seem particularly dated because it is generally tied to particular and immediate issues of the time (and it thus appears as history whereas the problems of art are immediate issues). More importantly, the critical writing of the 'thirties is so often organised as political attack (which was natural given the conditions of the time), and to those who have been introduced to and have accepted Marxism primarily as a tool of understanding this conception of Marxism as a "weapon" must appear strange.

Caudwell, although he was certainly as militant as any other writer of his generation, went far beyond most of the other critics of the 'thirties by expanding the area in which Marxist scholarship had been effectively applied. Despite the many defects of his work—the games he sometimes played with dialectics, the imprecise terms he used, the misleading statements (often essentially true but incorrect in the way they were stated), and the dreadful turgidness of much of his prose—Caudwell not only demonstrated the value of using a Marxist approach in fields not specifically dealt with by Marx and Engels, but he made valuable contributions to the studies of Marxism and literature. His fundamental achievement was what George Thomson has characterised as the first systematic attempt to work out a Marxist aesthetic. If this achievement is to be of value to Marxists today, we must examine Caudwell's aesthetic, not historically as a political contribution, but for what it contributes to Marxism as a guide to understanding.

Caudwell had an extremely wide range of interests, from physics and aeronautics to anthropology, psychology, and poetry. The only philosophy he found that could integrate all his many interests was historical materialism. In particular, Caudwell saw that only a Marxist approach could provide an understanding of the social significance of art and literature and only Marxism was capable of explaining that social significance while continuing to regard art and literature as art and literature; i.e., Marxism could find the social significance of all culture without distorting it by forcing works of art to be something other than what they were. Caudwell found that only Marxism could simultaneously consider both culture and society and integrate them in proper perspective; it led him to discover the nature and social function of art and literature and thus became the basis of his work.

Marxism and Aesthetics

Marxism itself presents no aesthetic. Although a collection of statements by Marx and Engels on literature and art has been published (*Literature and Art*, New York: International Publishers, 1947), this is at best a collection of perceptive comments on the subject, which by no means provides an aesthetic theory. What Marxism does provide is an approach to the problem, and through the use of the principles of Marx and Engels, many of which are directly applicable to literature, a Marxist aesthetic can be arrived at. The Marxist approach to literature (or art) recognises that literature, as a form of consciousness, has a definite relation to living. The basic premise of Marxist theory of literature is Marx's statement that consciousness is determined by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

being: "It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but, on the contrary, it is their social existence that determines their consciousness."[1] Literature, then, is dependent on how men live, and how they live is ultimately dependent on the economic basis of society:

> In the social production of their means of existence men enter into definite, necessary relations which are independent of their will, productive relationships which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces. The aggregate of these productive relationships constitutes the economic structure of society, the real basis on which a juridical and political superstructure arises, and to which definite forms of social consciousness correspond. The mode of production of the material means of existence conditions the whole process of social, political and intellectual life.[2]

This view entails a number of things for the Marxist. Most obviously, it means that art is dependent upon the society that produces it; the type of art depends on the type of society. Productive relations determine social relations and the type of consciousness of a society, and thus its artistic productions.

Although these concepts are basic to Marxist criticism, their limitations must be recognised. Too often in the 'thirties they were misused and too much was expected from them. They help us determine where literature fits into man's activities and help us understand questions of literary history such as why a certain age produces a certain type of literature, but they neither tell us what literature is nor guide us in our judgment of it. The criticism of the 'thirties was generally more concerned with the immediate problems of evaluating literature than with answering the more fundamental questions of literary theory, which was natural in such a politically charged atmosphere, but in this criticism many Marxist concepts relating to literature were overextended and poor criticism resulted. Many of the left-wing cultural figures of the time were newly acquainted with Marxism and perhaps found it easier to adopt in literature a political position that accompanied Marxism than to use Marxism creatively in their own field.

This inability to use Marxism creatively sometimes produced mechanical materialism (which Marx said is often a fault of younger Marxists) and some critics, neglecting to examine in detail the relationship between literature and society, were content to say simply that the basis determines the superstructure (of which literature is a part). Instead of recognising any complexity in this process they made it appear, in a most naïve fashion, that a change in the basis automatically, mechanically, produces a corresponding change in the superstructure so that a revolutionary change in the mode of production immediately revolutionises art. In the hands of some of the lesser critics of the 'thirties, Marxist cultural concepts become almost meaningless—"being determines consciousness" became a slogan rather than a guide to understanding.

The Function of Art and Literature

This misuse of Marxist concepts, if we reject the few examples of sheer stupidity, was probably the result of a faulty understanding of dialectics. Caudwell, with his excellent dialectical understanding, avoided most of these errors of immature Marxism and his comprehension was not limited to a simple process of cause and effect or a series of one-way relations; he saw inter-relations. His understanding that consciousness is determined by being was tempered by his recognition that unless this concept was understood dialectically, it was useless in providing a theory of literature. Certainly "being determines consciousness" can lead us to a recognition of social relations in works of art and can aid us in the study of literary history, but that is yet a far cry from a complete theory of art. To say merely that literature exhibits social relations was not enough for Caudwell.

An explanation of what literature is had to include for him what literature does; it had to show how literature is connected with society and it had to be an explanation of function. Like many Marxists before him, he turned first to primitive society. He saw how productive relations determined the art of the society, or simply, how primitive social being determined artistic consciousness, but he then asked how a society living at subsistence level could afford art. He asked what art did for the society and, not settling for an explanation such as "art is basic to human nature", he asked why art exists. In short, he asked how consciousness affected being—he asked what is the social function of literature. It was through his study of literature as it is related to society, guided by Marxism, that Caudwell developed his theory of the social function of literature. The beginnings of this theory can be seen in *Studies in a Dying Culture* and the fully developed theory can be seen in *Illusion and Reality*.

Caudwell's "Studies"

Caudwell presents in *Studies* what is in effect an expanded view of "being determines consciousness". Instead of treating the art work as a direct reflection

---

[1] Karl Marx, *A Contribution to "The Critique of Political Economy"*, in *A Handbook of Marxism*, ed. Emile Burns (New York: International Publishers, 1935), p. 372.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 371-2.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of being, he approaches it as an example, an instance, of the broader consciousness of society (which is determined by being). He is concerned with showing in detail how bourgeois being determines bourgeois consciousness, not only what bourgeois society is conscious of, but the very way in which the society sees things, the patterns of its thought and perception as well. His criticism might more appropriately be called social criticism than literary criticism. His discussion of literary figures such as D. H. Lawrence, for example, lacks particularity in regard to literature and he treats Lawrence as an example of bourgeois symptoms or concentrates on society as it is exhibited through Lawrence, rather than on the work of Lawrence.

Even if Caudwell's interest were concentrated more on Lawrence than on society, which is not the case, he believes that Lawrence as a writer cannot be understood in isolation but that if we are to understand what Lawrence is doing, as an artist as well as a bourgeois man, we must look at his relation to the whole society. He sees Lawrence, whose consciousness has been formed by bourgeois relationships, as a victim of the bourgeois illusion—the illusion that freedom is independence *from* society and social relations—and uses the idea of the illusion in explaining Lawrence's approach; or more exactly, he shows through Lawrence's use of it, how the bourgeois illusion exists in society. Caudwell is not content with repeating the abstract assertion; he attempts to use "being determines consciousness" to understand the present situation and show how our present concrete reality determines our present consciousness.

In *Studies* Caudwell began to discover a function for literature and saw it as a purposeful reflection of social being. Because literature provides a conscious, poignant experience, it must, says Caudwell, "modify the subject's general attitude towards life itself".[3] In terms of society, "art is the fashioning of the affective consciousness of its members, the conditioning of their instincts".[4] Literature creates in its audience an attitude towards the world, towards reality: "Art is the technique of affective manipulation in relation to reality".[5] Art accomplishes this manipulation by simultaneously producing an emotional response and organising it in relation to reality—the attitudes it produces are attached to a specific reality or parts of reality. Caudwell, at this stage, offered only a primitive beginning of his theory and, because his discussion was neither full nor very informative, we cannot be entirely certain what he really intended.

[3] Christopher Caudwell, *The Concept of Freedom* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1965), p. 15.

[4] *Loc. cit.*

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 24.

"Illusion and Reality"

In *Illusion and Reality* we see Caudwell's theory of function fully developed. He regarded his material as part of a social unity—culture could not be separated from society—and no single Marxist concept therefore was adequate to explain it. One Marxist premise shed light on another and his understanding of Marxism as a whole, rather than as a collection of isolated concepts, led him to develop his theory. While those critics who used "being determines consciousness" only in an historical fashion or reduced it to a battle cry saw in it only a one-way relation where consciousness merely existed but was not explained, Caudwell asked *why* being determines consciousness—he examined this concept dialectically. If being creates artistic consciousness (as well as determining its particular form), there must be some reason; consciousness must have some effect on being. If literature is a social product, Caudwell thought it must have some social use. His dialectical view of the concept, his asking how consciousness affects being, led him to look for a function for literature.

Fundamental to Caudwell's examination of the function of literature was Marx's Thesis XI on Feuerbach: "The philosophers have only *interpreted* the world, in various ways; the point, however, is to *change* it."[6] Although Thesis XI had for most of the critics of the 'thirties only the limited meaning that we must make a revolution instead of interpreting the world, Caudwell found Thesis XI to be basic in understanding man's activity. He understood from Thesis XI that all of man's activity is directed to changing the world (not only in the sense of a revolution) to make it better accord with his desires. Man acts in the world to secure his freedom; i.e., to satisfy his basic desires and then to fulfil his particular human potential. His purpose is to realise his individuality. His individual actions are directed toward that end and the society, when functioning properly (when production relations are not a brake on productive forces), operates to help him attain his goal. This realisation of his individuality is dependent upon economic production. Not only does economic production provide the basic needs of life, without which we cannot even consider the question of individuality, but it also provides the social complexity within which a man can realise his individual characteristics. Freedom, says Caudwell, is an economic product. Art, which is a social

[6] Karl Marx, "Theses on Feuerbach" in *Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy* by Frederick Engels (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1950), p. 99.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

product, serves the goal of man's freedom and, as Caudwell discovered, also has an economic function.

Poetry's Purpose

In primitive society, it can clearly be seen that poetry is important for the society's economic production. Man's economic production in society is, by definition, a result of co-operation, but that co-operation is not instinctive. A tribe, in response to some disaster such as fire or earthquake, will show an instinctive and collective response, but in regard to something that is not immediately present, such as a harvest-to-be, there is no instinctive reaction and therefore the energy and emotion of men must be channelled. The effort of the group must be directed towards some useful (i.e., economic) end.

> It is necessary to prepare the ground for harvest. It is necessary to set out on an expedition of war. It is necessary to retrench and retract in the long scarcity of winter. These collective obligations demand from man the service of his instinctive energy, yet there is no instinct which tells him to give them. Ants and bees store instinctively; but man does not. It is necessary to harness man's instincts to the mill of labour, to collect his emotions and direct them into the useful, the economic channel. Just because it is economic, *i.e.* non-instinctive, this instinct must be *directed*. The instrument which directs them is therefore economic in origin.[7]

In helping to resolve the contradiction between the desires of the private individual and the needs of society, poetry is performing an economic function. "Poetry is a productive or economic activity of man. To separate it from this foundation makes its development impossible to understand."[8] An economic role for poetry has often been seen for primitive society, but Caudwell sees literature as having an economic function by its nature—a function that certainly is not restricted to primitive society.

It should be emphasised that Caudwell, in speaking of poetry's economic function, did not intend that function to be confused with the functioning of the economic basis of society, the actual means of production and production relations. Poetry is clearly part of the superstructure of society which arises on the economic basis—it does not itself make any of the necessities of life—but it serves an economic function and, says Caudwell, in serving such a function it is essentially economic. Poetry's job, even if we cannot yet speak of its conscious purpose, is economic.

Poetry's function of furthering a collective feeling has been widely enough recognised (though it may not usually have been described as an economic function), but Caudwell sees a further function for poetry that has economic consequences. Society directs the employment of social resources to maximise certain goals; it directs social effort towards the ends which it establishes. Although most of these goals are economic, in that they concern increased economic production, they need not all be economic (something that becomes important when we consider the questions raised by the transition from socialism to communism).

Here we can see with Caudwell a broader function for poetry (and art in general). Not only does poetry create a collective spirit, but it helps to give direction to that spirit—it helps to determine the social goals. Poetry helps to bridge the gap between man's desire and reality by clarifying his desires and directing his emotions towards some end. Art is value propaganda; it helps man to determine the hierarchy of his values. By ordering values of individuals in a community (rather than in occasional separate personalities), it also creates a collective spirit—but a particular collective spirit, a collective spirit directed towards some goal.

Culture and Reality

All culture, viewed in terms of Marx's Thesis XI on Feuerbach, has the purpose of helping man to bridge the gap between desire and reality. Man's contact with reality—his interpenetration with nature—makes culture necessary and also produces that culture. Contact with the real world produces the need for culture (man needs theory in order to operate more effectively on reality), and it also provides the experience on which that culture is based. Culture and material reality exist in a dialectical unity. All culture helps man to change reality—art, through the direction or reorganisation of his desire.

> The conflict between man's instincts and environmental reality is precisely what life is, and all the products of society—hats, art, science, houses, sport, ethics and political organisation—are adaptations evolved to moderate and cure that conflict.[9]

Art, if it is functioning properly, does not attempt to cure this conflict by smoothing it over, but by directing man's emotions towards reality and by helping him to see what will have to be altered in reality to make reality fulfil his desires. Although it does not tell him how to go about getting it, art makes clear to man what he wants. It is a guide to action. Art, by making an illusion of reality, presenting it as man wants it to be, creates a programme of values for altering reality, and creates at the same

[7] Christopher Caudwell, *Illusions and Reality: A Study of the Sources of Poetry* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1958), p. 27.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 44.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 167.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

time the collective emotional basis for that action.

If art has a social, an economic, function, it is not simply a theoretical activity. Certainly, if we make a clear separation between theory and practice, art would be a theoretical activity, but Caudwell could not fit art neatly and permanently into either category. Theory and practice form a dialectical unity and art, though it is a body of theoretical material, has also an active function. In its theoretical aspect, art is the study of human emotion—knowledge of man's "instincts". In its practical aspect, art is the actual changing and challenging of the emotions of men. Caudwell is very clear that art's practical aspect is not just a problem of misunderstanding "theory". Art actually changes men's emotional orientation. If art were only a form of consciousness on which emotional reorientation is based, then it would be only theoretical; but as something actually, actively *changing* men's orientation, it is practical as well. Caudwell sees beyond the bourgeois hypostatisation of the art work (art seen as a static work of art)—he sees art as a process. Art as a process, as something operating in society, is practical.

Similarly, science, which Caudwell views as the counterpart of art, has both theoretical and practical sides. In its theoretical role, science is the study of the external world; science in its practical rôle is the changing of the world guided by theoretical knowledge of that world. Somewhat confusingly, Caudwell expresses this:

> Art and science play contradictory and yet intermingled rôles in the sphere of theory. Science in cognition gives art a projected selection from external reality which art organises and makes affectively appealing, so that the energy of the genotype is directed towards imposing its desires on that external reality.[10]

Science, says Caudwell, fulfils its function "by adapting external reality to the genotype just as art adapts the genotype to external reality".[11]

Art and Action

Caudwell was not alone in seeing art as practical or a "guide to action", but too often this was a shibboleth of left-wing criticism rather than the product of a sound theory of literature and society. To say that art is a "guide to action" in practical terms is meaningless—it is only a metaphor—unless we can say *how* art guides action. Here Caudwell's achievement stands out very clearly from the other critics of the 'thirties. The view most commonly indicated in the 'thirties was that art guides action through the intellectual content it contains. Plekhanov expressed this point well much earlier in the century, saying that art has a real content which is instructive. A hunting dance, for example, would teach the audience some characteristics of the animal to be hunted or some other knowledge useful for the hunt. Certainly we learn through reading and seeing (though what we learn through listening to music is a more difficult question) and Caudwell gives limited acceptance to such a view. What he considers the important part of this learning, the part peculiar to art, is learning about our emotions. In art we see a pattern of emotional causes and reactions from which we can better understand the nature, character, and specific qualities of man's emotions. That is art as theory. But more important for Caudwell is art's practical side—art is a guide to action by manipulating the "instincts", by reorganising the emotions. Art then is an *emotional* guide to action.

Again, the formulation "art is an emotional guide to action" is inadequate unless we examine its effect with regard to real individuals. Caudwell made the point very clearly that art does not mysteriously affect the whole society as if it were one organic art appreciator, but must work through individuals. Men make their own history, Marx and Engels said, and history does nothing by itself. Though individual men decide and will different things, it is not any one but the aggregate of these wills that results in history. Similarly, art's social function does not affect society on the general or abstract level but affects concrete individuals and the sum total of these separate concrete effects is the social effect of art. For his theory of function to be meaningful, Caudwell thought it necessary, then, that he examine the concrete effect of art on the individual. This he did as much as possible, limited by the deficiencies of psychological knowledge of the time. He was forced into such terminology as "instinct" and "genotype" but clearly recognised their limitations and their mythological character and mentioned this inadequacy.

Emotional Guide to Action

Poetry, for Caudwell, can be a guide to action because of certain characteristics of language in general. Language involves both cognition and feeling because it is a product of social living and developed through social use, says Caudwell, and thus words, generally, not only signify a thing (denotation) but express an attitude towards it (connotation). The word involves both the reference to the object or idea (its rational aspect) and the attitude of the subject towards the object (its emotional aspect). Poetry produces its emotional reaction, basically, by linking things that have emotional associations and relying on the connotations of words. The various elements in the poem are not organised rationally to present clearly an idea or

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 264.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 263.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

concept, but are organised emotionally to create an attitude. The poem then is not an objective picture of reality, but what Caudwell has called an illusion. It is a subjective picture of reality or a projection of emotion on to reality. Reality is rearranged by the emotion in the poem and we are shown the emotion through its projection on parts of reality in the poem.

That is the illusion of poetry—illusion, says Caudwell, because it is not what we meet in real life but a selection of reality arranged for our own purposes. It is a picture of reality that is emotionally but not objectively correct. In literature and art in general (most music may be an exception) the objective reality is distorted in varying degrees, better to present the emotional reality.

The illusion of art induces an attitude towards the specific reality with which it deals and thus art guides action. The art work presents us not simply with an emotional response but with emotion organised in a context that gives it meaning. The affect, or emotional reaction, says Caudwell, is a conscious judgment (we react consciously to the poem or painting) and a judgment must be a judgment of something—of the reality contained in the work. If the work of art contains a recognisable part of the real world, the emotional attitude produced in the art is towards the reality we see through it.

We can see this in, for example, Blake's poem *London*. Blake may create an attitude of horror but it is not pure horror; it is horror attached to industrial London. We can see more clearly to what the attitude is attached in works that depend on a recognisable reality. Sillitoe's *The Loneliness of the Long Distance Runner* produces a respect for human individuality and a hatred for the class structure of society—not as separate emotional responses, but in relation to each other. His artistic organisation within which these emotions are created makes us hate class structure because we value individuality. Sillitoe offers an emotional guide to action. It is an emotional rather than a rational guide because he makes us feel how the class structure is destructive to individuality rather than analysing the problem. Rather than proposing a rational programme on which we can act, he provides us with an attitude towards elements of the reality which may motivate our action. Thus, if Sillitoe has created in me an emotional reorganisation that involves an antipathy towards capitalism, when I am faced with a decision in reference to capitalism, my rational decision may be founded on my reorganised emotion. Although I act rationally to effect my desire, that desire has been shaped by the work of art.

The emotional guide to action can perhaps be seen more clearly in the works of Harold Pinter which have a recognisable, though less objective, reality. Pinter, in *The Birthday Party*, might make us feel simultaneously a sympathy for Stanley, the hero, and a dislike of social pressures (represented perhaps by Goldberg and McCann). These two emotional responses are not separate but occur, are organised by Pinter, in relation to each other—they form an emotional unity. The relation between the destruction of the hero and social pressures can be meaningful only emotionally because, unlike Sillitoe's work, there is not a clear enough objective reality in the play for us to subject it to rational analysis.

Certainly, *The Birthday Party* cannot then provide a rational guide to action, but it produces a strong emotional response in the audience. This response can cause us, when the opportunity arises in reality, to act rationally against the system that creates that pressure, and thus the play presents an emotional guide to action. Even though it may not provide us with the programme itself, the work of art can provide us with an attitude on the basis of which we can then decide rationally between various political programmes. That is the function served by the social process of art.

The Critic's Criterion

If the work of art lacks a content that includes the recognisable outside world—most music and non-objective art—it still produces an emotional attitude or an outlook, although its emotion cannot be seen as a conscious judgment of any particular thing. It is not necessary that the work present the outside world for it to be a guide to action. A Vivaldi concerto or a Chinese vase are also guides to action because they produce an attitude in their audience that is in part an attitude towards the world. Lenin's remark that he could not listen to music because it would make him too soft for the task he had to carry out is very much to the point—music would produce in him an attitude that at the time was not useful. Vivaldi may give the listener a feeling of pleasure and induce a taste for order, for example; it may provide him with an attitude of acceptance. Gazing at a Chinese vase may produce in me a delight in the beauty of a line and perhaps a taste for inaction or a desire simply to contemplate the vase's beauty and let things remain as they are. Something that recommends or induces inaction may be a false guide when action is called for but it is a guide to action nonetheless.

Caudwell's understanding of art as a guide to action is also important for the critic. While a rough version of "art as a guide to action" was used as a criterion by other critics of the 'thirties, often it was no more than the question of a work's overt politica

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

viewpoint. The critics looking for a standard were unable to use "guide to action" successfully; whereas Caudwell, in an effort to analyse literature generally rather than to engage in immediate criticism, offers to us what is perhaps the fundamental principle of evaluation for Marxist criticism.

In a certain sense, Caudwell's theory of function offers us an objective criterion for the evaluation of literature. His study of literature has shown that literature has a definite and functional relation to the society which produces it. He has shown that by its very nature literature is functional. The critic need not invent non-literary criteria to criticise a work of literature but can ask simply whether or not a work fulfils its social function. Caudwell's study of literature has enabled us to see that the criterion of social function is not something extra-literary but fundamental to the nature of literature. Art, like other social products, serves a social function in helping men to increase their freedom. Very simply, then, art is a good or bad guide to action as it leads men towards or away from freedom; as it shows them the meaning of and possibilities in their reality, or as it merely satisfies the emotions while obscuring the qualities of reality.

This criterion, of course, is not simple. Very few works of literature could be evaluated simply by asking this one question—we must remember that art is an emotional guide to action and not a rational programme for acting on reality. Thus to reach the point where we can answer whether or not the work is a good or bad guide to action, there are many questions that we must first consider and many facets of the work that we must analyse. Here we encounter what might be considered the more conventional literary criteria, such as unity and probability, but clearly it is not enough to answer only these questions. To decide on the value of a work as a guide to action we must also examine such things as the work's positive or negative attitude towards life, the coherence of its attitude, the integration of its values, its demonstration (as opposed to objective discussion) of its attitudes, etc. Since it is to be a guide in our immediate reality we must ask whether the author is reacting to reality as it in fact is or whether his reaction is based on a misunderstanding or a distorted view of reality. It is the last type of question with which Caudwell concerned himself in his essays in *Studies* and thus he attacks D. H. Lawrence for misunderstanding reality and leading his audience not to freedom but to unfreedom.

In *Studies* and *Illusion and Reality* Caudwell obviously employed criteria in evaluating the figures of contemporary culture and literary history, though unfortunately he made these criteria neither explicit nor clear. He hardly began to offer critical standards, yet he did make clear a direction for criticism and he carefully explained the fundamental question towards which Marxist criticism must address itself. Most importantly, he provided the aesthetic theory on which a sound Marxist criticism can be based. It is up to this generation of Marxists concerned with literature to carry on his achievement. Caudwell was a brilliant and a creative Marxist. The range of vision and immense dialectical understanding he brought to bear on the study of poetry led him to see fully the whole process of poetry in all its social interconnections and made him constantly aware that the means of poetry were only means—means to the end of man's greater freedom.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Discussion Contributions on:

Marxism and Criticism

B. D. Bergquist

ONLY, surely, in this, the century of the columnist-critic, could it be claimed—as does Alfred Corum—that the function of criticism is "simplification and explanation", only in this permissive, shell-shocked century. It is an easy concept of the critic's role, one which conveniently ignores the questions of value and judgement, and one which must appeal to many Oracles of the National Press. The newspaper critic cannot allow his verdicts to stray far or often from what his paper's readership will tolerate. For him it is expedient to praise the acceptable, lambast the predictably unacceptable, and ignore all else. Such criticism certainly simplifies, and may even explain, albeit crudely; but it is criticism degenerated to the level of reassuring the set-minded and prejudiced that their particular God is in his heaven, and that despite all the Cathy-come-homes, all is right with their particular world.

Value Judgements

No-one would accuse Alfred Corum of such an attitude, but is this not the reverse side of his concept of criticism? Something is missing, and surely at its simplest, that something is judgement. The critic cannot avoid value judgements, if only in selecting what to discuss and what to neglect. My premise is that this is the heart of criticism, and that without this, the critic becomes the mere middle-man Corum claims him to be, whose existence is justified only by the appreciation gap, and the consequent need for interpretation.

An examination of the historical development of criticism shows that here we have an intellectual discipline which in its own right has contributed to the advancement of human thought: not in isolation from the primary arts, nor separate from the development of knowledge in other fields, but certainly on occasion, in advance of both, and never subordinate to either. The dialectical inter-relationship between criticism and—for example—developments in the literary sphere, can be discerned by the Marxist in the history of criticism as outlined in such works as Watson's[1] and as much can be said for the development of the other arts. Criticism is itself a creative activity.

Yet intellectual or artistic activity, as has correctly been pointed out, unless directed to some active end, becomes mere cerebration. If, as is claimed, the artists are changing the world, it is no less the the task of the critic to do likewise. In particular, we demand of the Marxist critic that he be concerned not only with the development of art as an end in itself, but as part of the struggle for the advancement of mankind generally. For this reason the class aspect cannot be ignored. Reaction must be exposed, clinically, in such as Eliot, Lawrence, Yeats. But it would be a retreat to philistinism to ignore their achievements. No useful purpose is served by recommending the work of 'A' and condemning that of 'B' simply on account of their respective class attitudes, or even the class attitudes implicit in their work. The works in themselves must be considered, comprehensively. It may then be seen that all 'A' 's class consciousness cannot save his work from justifiable oblivion; it may well be that all 'B' 's reaction—and T. S. Eliot is a case in point—may be transcended in a simple statement of humanity, such as "The love song of J. Alfred Prufrock". The critic—Marxist or otherwise—must look to the future development of his field, and will evaluate works accordingly. If his criticism is meaningful, if it is creative, it cannot fail to influence that development. But it must not be forgotten, that the right to criticise, to judge, like the right to lead, must be earned.

To recapitulate, the Marxist critic is concerned with the development and advancement of ideas, through the medium of the arts. His work is itself creative, itself an art form, drawing inspiration from the primary art forms. It is not concerned with such irrelevancies as constructing meaningless league tables of artists where Eliot is ranked "lower than possibly lesser poets such as William Morris".

Breakdown of Communication

The importance of all this—aside from the importance of all developments of human knowledge—hinges about the significance of art—or Art, as it is so often written—for the working class generally. I mentioned the appreciation gap, and

[1] George Watson—"The Literary Critics", Pelican Series, Penguin Books.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

some attention must be paid to it here, for it is very clear that the division between artist and public is in many instances widening. Recent upheavals in the fields of painting, sculpture, music and many aspects of literature, have seen a complete breakdown in communication. We have seen the arrival of the self-destructive painting, the concentration on "pure experience", and even unique experience, where for example, the painting—to extend the term to its limit—consists of changing patterns of light which never repeat themselves. The public suspects fraud, with some cause, and it is difficult to see how simplification and explanation are going to allay that suspicion, or prevent the rift from deepening. For once the artist finds it possible to make a living without concerning himself with being understood by the majority of people, he soon discards the need to say anything meaningful at all; hence the concentration on "pure experience"—whatever that might be. It is no coincidence, I think, that drug taking is so often associated with the wilder fringe of the artistic world.

The critic—bourgeois or Marxist—finds himself in a quandary. If he is a journalist—as many are—he has to say something, if only to ensure that the weekly bills get paid, frequently about an artist who has taken great pains to exclude everything remotely meaningful from his work. Particularly in the world of painting, this century has seen a fantastically rapid succession of "schools", each with its attendant publicists and partisans, and one can understand the critic who gives up and leaps on each bandwagon as it appears.

The Marxist critic cannot do this, but he would be wrong to yield to the very real temptation to dismiss the whole chaotic assembly as worthless. Art reflects ruthlessly the society in which it is created—often more so than the artist intended or realised. Generations to come may well see in one of Andy Warhol's outsize depictions of a soup tin, much of the artificial and distorted values of decaying capitalist society. The concentration on the abstract—does this not accompany the depersonalisation and alienation of an economic system where the worth of a man is measured in such an abstraction as profitability? And if despite all discouragement, interest in the abstract art forms has survived in the Socialist countries, is this not as much an indication that alienation remains in an industrialised environment even when Socialism is achieved as of the influence of decadent capitalist art forms? I wonder if modern music and art are as futile as Alfred Corum suggests. Are they not more of an indictment of twentieth century civilisation? Do they not underline the problems at the human, individual level, which only Socialism can and must tackle?

And yet, the point, once again, is not just to depict, but to change, and to inspire change. For this, art must have an impact on the masses. It is necessary to restore communication, to make art intelligible—here at least we are agreed.

But this does not simply mean a return by the class-conscious artist to the representative and the pictorial modes. Certainly it would be a brave man who would claim that no worth-while developments are possible in this type of art; but it would, I contend, be a most foolhardy one who would attempt to put the clock back and ignore the whole of four decades of development in the abstract arts.

Intelligible Art

How then, is art to become more intelligible? Perhaps one should ask what is meant by intelligible art. When we see a Rembrandt self portrait, do we call it intelligible because it is immediately clear that we are looking at an old man, at a likeness of Rembrandt? If so pictorial art was rendered obsolete with the invention of the camera. But the exacting test of time has shown that the painting carries more impact than could be attributed to a simple likeness or photo of an old man. For myself, I experience the painting subjectively, but after an objective examination. The subject is not just the aged Rembrandt, but age itself. The pallid face, staring across the years from the shadows into which it will shortly retreat for ever, is scored and worn with the ravages of time and a lifetime of struggle. I have seen such faces in doorways in back streets. The furiously worked up texture—the artist even raking the surface with the pointed handle of his brush—evokes even now the savagery with which Rembrandt depicted himself. Such is my impression. But the painting is just pigment on flat canvas. Even the simple, mental reconstruction of Rembrandt's likeness, the interpretation of the two-dimensional representation, demands an elementary effort at re-creation on our part; as much would be required of us by the photo. But in my short, potted appreciation, I have gone beyond that. I have taken the painting as the jumping-off point for my own inspiration, the creation of my own, internal impression. The next person to view the painting might feel and experience nothing of this, or experience something completely different. It is my contention that the Rembrandt has survived so many contemporary works, because of its value as such a spring-board for so many people, inspiring in them experiences which transcend the simple pictorial content of the painting. But this experience is not attained by passively waiting for the picture to speak, to emit some message, but by critical examination of what the artist has done, and equally important, how he has done it. For me—as well as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the dictionary—art is synonymous with skill, the skill to evoke a creative response in the critical observer. I think that behind such a curious statement as "The artist is only a craftsman at a higher level", Alfred Corum might well find grounds for agreeing.

The concept of intelligible art is not, then, as simple as has been implied. The synthesis of the dialectic between artist and subject is the work of the artist; the synthesis of that between the work of art and the observer, is the observer's response. And this, I agree, will vary from person to person. But it will also vary for a particular person; if the work is worth while—and this is surely the only test of value where art is concerned—the response will deepen with the depth of critical appraisal.

Not by Coercion

But an effort is called for on the part of the observer. And thus when we call for intelligible art, we must also call for a critically informed public, willing to discuss their experience. Once again, as Marxists, we come up against the problem of education, and the need for it. Alfred Corum is right to call attention to the educational facilities available; they must be encouraged, and they must be extended. The Communist Party has a clear role to play in this, as well as in exhorting artists to take up the cudgels in the class struggle.

However, that role is not served by coercion of the artist, and the attempts to suppress inconvenient works and art forms in the Socialist countries cannot be supported. Surely as Communists we can have confidence in the public ultimately to sort out the wheat from the chaff. Our responsibility is to see that the public is informed. That is the role of the Marxist critic, to point the way forward, to inform, to encourage, to be himself creative. And let him not forget, that if humility is a virtue in an artist, it is no less so in a critic.

D. A. Wilson

IF one who thinks Marx is perhaps the most fundamental thinker of the modern age in politics, economics, sociology and philosophy is to be a Marxist, then I am one. I have found myself, however, for a good deal more than thirty years utterly out of sympathy with the writings and pronouncements of most of those who claim the Marxist label.

Yet I have never for a moment felt disposed to go over to those who all my life have been busy exposing the fallacies of Marxism, and using him as a bogey, a butt, a cock-shy. Hence I have kept touch with writings claiming a Marxist inspiration, and have been therefore a regular reader of *Marxism Today* and similar publications. I have had a few impulses to take part in discussions, but only now do so.

The occasion is the contribution of Michael Long under the above heading in the November 1966 issue. This seemed to me such an exceptionally fine example of genuine thought on a Marxist basis, that I was quite surprised to see it there.

Did not Long awaken us to how we cannot understand the world unless we accept the help of those born with the most extraordinary sensitivity and gifts of expression to disclose what the world really is? That is, the artists? Do they not provide us with the most essential information for us to exercise our Marxism upon?

I do believe that if some of our Marxists had been alive in Shakespeare's time he would have had short shrift, with all that backward-looking stuff he wrote. To ridicule Jack Cade! To glorify Coriolanus—indeed!

Have we not been taught in the dialectics of Marx that everything should be seen in its manifold relationships, and in its state of change and motion? If so, would it not appear that Fenollosa might have been of great use to us? Were we not taught by Marx that ideology was a superstructure upon an economic base? And that when the base changed, so did the other; but not in a superficial, puerile manner and mechanistic fashion, but within a most complex living process of inter-related action and reaction?

Artist Value

Why, then, when a poet and sensitive literary critic, with a considerable historical understanding tells us that there was a "dissociation of sensibility" affecting "the mind of England" in the middle of the 17th century—was there not here something worthy of examination by Marxists in relation to this complex of base and superstructure?

Did not Pound, Yeats, and Lawrence provide us with similar insights to exercise our Marxism upon? Or did we not merely attack them for the conservative aspects of their picture? Surely these are not politicians and philosophers, even if some of them thought they were. They are artists, and therefore invaluable to all of us, for us to choose what of their material we can use. They would be so much less

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the artist if they reflected only an aspect of their age. But we leave them for the reactionaries to make use of, exclusively.

I think with Michael Long that every artist we stifle merely contributes to our own blindness and deafness. Who can judge the value of an artist except a better artist then he? And how can we tell, now? Better foster one who turns out to be a bad craftsman than choke someone who may be our very eyes and ears. We do not want to take painful strides towards a better social order only to find we have lost our vision. Has not this been happening?

How Abilities are Formed

Nanette Whitbread

(*The author is Senior Lecturer in Education at the City of Leicester College of Education*)

BARRIE STACEY'S and David Craig's articles, in the February and March numbers of *Marxism Today* respectively, raise essentially similar problems.

Barrie Stacey wrote:

> "Human personality and consciousness, intelligence and abilities develop, in the course of social living. This means that it is necessary to find out in detail how such development occurs. In particular, we need to know how abilities are formed, how they are structured, and how they are influenced by the forces which impinge on the child both in and out of school."

David Craig, drawing on Liam Hudson's researches and his postulate of "divergers" and "convergers", wrote: "it seems that we must recognise that a good deal of the Arts/Science bias is 'given', by heredity and early upbringing", and then made proposals for lessening the worst effects of this division into apparent types of ability. He seems more willing than Hudson himself was to attribute these differences in ability or aptitude to heredity rather than to parental attitudes, home environment and the consequent development of personality. A theory of innate "types" is apparently more acceptable if the "types" do not coincide with special class.

Verbal Transmission

But Liam Hudson made a suggestion which, in the light of Basil Bernstein's researches,[1] is highly significant. "I am attracted to a type of explanation more directly tied to the actual verbal transactions which take place between parent and child."[2] Both Bernstein and Hudson dwelt on the extremes in their respective classifications in order to highlight characteristics rather than to be dogmatic.

The implications of restriction to "*a public language*" were summarised by Bernstein as "a relatively low level of conceptualisation, an orientation to a low order of causality, a disinterest in processes, a preference to be aroused by, and respond to, that which is immediately given, rather than to implications of a matrix of relationships". He also noted that such a child is "peculiarly receptive to drill methods" of teaching, and more inclined to learn from "concrete as against logical or abstract presentation". Here is the Norwood classification[3] explained by restriction to "a public language" which is in turn related to social class.

It would seem that there may be some correlation with Hudson's converger scientist's "practical commitment" which precludes free imaginative thinking because of his more restricted conceptual freedom. "Divergers, not convergers—arts specialists, not scientists—analyse objects in terms of general categories." This suggests that divergers have learnt a greater facility in the use of "*a formal* language"—if we accept Bernstein's contention that "with a *formal* language, meaning is logically explicit and finely differentiated". Perhaps Bernstein's theories may be too securely based on social strata. May there not be *restrictive* language patterns in families of some middle class scientists, technologists, or, even, religious dogmatists?

The mechanical conclusion would be that children of the lower working class, unskilled and semi-skilled social strata, are likely to be convergers. This is patently not proven: Hudson's researches were, in any case, conducted among public and grammar school pupils, especially Sixth Formers. The converse, however, may contain some truth: the lower

[1] "Social Class and Linguistic Development: A Theory of Social Learning", by Basil Bernstein, in *Education, Economy and Society*, ed. A. H. Halsey, J. Floud and C. A. Anderson (1961, N.Y.).

[2] Liam Hudson, *Contrary Imaginations* (1966).

[3] Report of the Committee of the Secondary Schools Examination Council on Curriculum and Examinations in Secondary Schools (1943).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the social strata the less likely the bias towards divergence.

Significance of Language

All this exemplifies and confirms Barrie Stacey's conclusions. It also once again emphasises the significance of language, and hence of early childhood language learning, in determining patterns of thought and the development of personality and abilities. It certainly shows the correctness of the Plowden Report's new principle of positive discrimination in education, and that "giving everybody the maximum educational opportunity may mean creating individual educational environments".[4]

The effects of the New Mathematics and Nuffield Science on diverger/converger bias and other abilities from the primary school upwards will need careful longitudinal study. Early linguistic experience in a skilfully planned environment—the nursery school—seems the point for an educational approach to begin. Tertiary or even secondary stages are too late, though cross- and dual-discipline courses at tertiary would facilitate a greater unity of curricula policy between primary and secondary.

Research for curriculum development at all levels of the educational structure is certainly needed. It must be guided by psychological enquiry using qualitative methods through further development studies, not least linguistic.

[4] Children and Their Primary Schools, Vol. 1 (1967).

MARX HOUSE ACTIVITIES

1867—Centenary of Marx's Capital—1967

May 19th—THE ENGLAND THAT MARX WROTE ABOUT IN "CAPITAL"
by Lionel Munby

June 2nd—"CAPITAL"—A REVOLUTION IN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL THINKING
by Henry Collins

June 16th—THE VALIDITY OF MARXISM IN THE '60s
by J. R. Campbell

All at Marx House—7.30 p.m.

DISCUSSION CONFERENCE

SUNDAY, JUNE 25th, 11 a.m. - 5 p.m.

"The Social Consequences of Automation"

Opening statement by J. R. Shanley

To attend write to Librarian enclosing 3s. 6d. which entitles you to copy of opening statement
Marx House, 37a Clerkenwell Green, E.C.1

Published by the Communist Party, 16 King Street, London, W.C.2, and printed by Farleigh Press Ltd. (T.U. all depts.), Watford, Herts.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Collet's

announce that their

MULTILINGUAL BOOKSHOP

has now moved to more commodious premises on the lower floor at

289 High Holborn, London, W.C.1
(*in the premises of Collet's Paperback Bookshop*)

In addition to East European languages the shop will now carry a selection of language material in French, Spanish, German, Greek, etc.

Collet's have just produced a list of interesting maps and atlases. These are mainly of the U.S.S.R. but some from the G.D.R. and Czechoslovakia are included.

The regional and specialised maps from the U.S.S.R.—large coloured maps usually in 4 sheets for wall use—are quite cheap (7s.-15s.) and are intended for school geography classes.

Technical, scientific and medical titles in English from various East European countries, available from Collet's back stock, have also now been listed.

Please write for lists to:

COLLET'S HOLDINGS LTD.
Denington Estate, Wellingborough, Northants.

just published:

THE PETTICOAT REBELLION

Marian Ramelson

see article in this issue of MARXISM TODAY

illustrated **42s**

SCIENCE TODAY Series No. 1:

THE SCIENTIFIC REVOLUTION

John Moss

"John Moss . . . deals not only with fields in which there have been spectacular advances, as in space science, genetics, computer technology and automated industry, but also the many fields where the application of modern scientific research methods has languished, such as the elimination of slums, smog and road accidents . . . Lawrence & Wishart are to be congratulated on initiating this series . . . "—Prof. E. H. S. Burhop in the *Morning Star*.

paper **6s**

LAWRENCE & WISHART

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New books from the USSR

VASILISA THE BEAUTIFUL

Russian Fairy Tales

A delightful selection of 16 traditional fairy tales, beautifully illustrated throughout in colour.

213 pp **15s**

RUSSIAN FOLK ARTS AND CRAFTS

Y. Ovsyannikov

Describes with a wealth of illustrations the traditional folk arts and crafts of Russia, including woodcarving—ceramics—bone and horn work, and the famous Palekh, Mastera and Fedoskino lacquer objects.

238 pp 100 photographs 62 in colour **50s**

OUTER SPACE AND MAN

27 authors

A fascinating miscellany of information and explanation, explaining in popular form the nature of the problems of space exploration and their solution up to now.

285 pp paper **9s**

PERSONAL PROPERTY IN THE USSR

R. Khalfin

Popular exposition of the Soviet law on property owned by individuals: what they may own and how they may dispose of it—and inherit it.

106 pp paper **5s**

CENTRAL BOOKS

37 Grays Inn Road London WC1

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW 1967—No. 4

S. TODOROV

Towards a Developed Socialist Society

JACK WODDIS

The Old British Imperialism and the New

M. VILNER

Present Developments in Israel

Price 2s. 6d. (plus 6d. postage)
15s. for 6 months
30s. for 1 year

from

CENTRAL BOOKS LTD.
37 Gray's Inn Road, London, WC1

COMMUNIST PARTY HOLIDAY SCHOOL LOSEHILL HALL, CASTLETON

(In the heart of the Peak District)

August 5th-12th, 1967

on

"Capitalism and Socialism in the Sixties"

Lectures on "100 Years of 'Capital' and its relevance today"; "50 years of Socialism in the U.S.S.R., the Socialist World today"; "Prospects of the African Revolution"; "Some Problems of Marxism today"; "Socialism, Freedom and the Individual"; "Problems of Culture today"; etc. etc.

Cost: £11 per head

Apply to:

Education Department,
Communist Party,
16 King Street, London, W.C.2.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED